

Spearhead

£1.50

No. 416

OCTOBER 2003

ISSN 1364-7105

They're massing at Calais...



... AND THEY'RE COMING HERE!

See 'What We Think'
(pages 2 & 3)

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE:-

- A look at the Government's proposed 'Britishness' test
- Blair and Bush: agents of destruction and chaos
- British intelligence in tatters
- Hypocrisy and the 'liberal' conscience
- News from the British National Party


WHAT WE THINK

The verdict of Brent

The by-election in Brent East delivered, more devastatingly than perhaps any one so far, the verdict of the voters on a government of corruption, dishonesty and unparalleled incompetence. A mere 36 per cent of the electorate turned out, and Labour suffered the humiliation of having a majority of 13,047 at the general election two years ago wiped out as the Liberal Democrats beat them by 1,118 votes. The 29-year-old Lib-Dem candidate and new MP, Sarah Teather, hardly looks the kind of person likely to set parliament on fire, and it is doubtful that many of the voters had the slightest idea what she or her party stood for. The vote, however, was one against a useless and hated prime minister at the head of a useless and hated party. And the Tories, being almost invisible in terms of an Opposition, failed utterly to exploit this disillusionment.

An apt commentary on the result appeared in the leader column of the *Daily Mail* of September 20th:-

Nationalist comment



The inane girlie grin is missing here. Quite obviously, Tony is worried – and he has every reason to be.

“Truly, Thursday’s by-election provided a disturbing insight into the apathy, despair and insidious cynicism now corroding Britain’s democracy...

“British soldiers are losing their lives in Iraq. We are paying a bitter price for a war fought on a false prospectus. Public services go from bad to worse. Nothing works as it should. Taxes have risen sharply and will certainly go up again. And every day the drip, drip, drip of damning evidence at the Hutton Inquiry exposes our rulers at their bullying, mendacious worst....

“Who, after all, now believes a word this Government says or trusts any of its promises? New Labour has poisoned our political culture. Trust has vanished. Belief has gone. Expectations are nil. So where are voters to turn?

“Not, on present form, to the Tories. Despite an appalling summer for New Labour, they have hardly registered on the radar screen...

“All this is deeply worrying. For if voters are offered no acceptable choice, frustration and political extremism cannot be far behind.”

In the last sentence here there is an interesting and curious allusion. ‘Extremism’? Now just what might that mean? Is it really to be considered ‘extreme’ to offer remedies for the nation’s problems that are different – radically and fundamentally different – from those that have proved such a failure in the past? We ask this because the run-down of Britain that has taken place under the Government of Tony Blair is removed from that preceding it only in degree, in speed and in the prominence given to its truly spectacular disasters and cock-ups. Nor does this Government’s manifest dishonesty and crookedness mark any special departure from what went before. Could there have been any more blatant lie than that put over on the British electorate by Tory leader Ted Heath thirty years ago when he assured us all that going into Europe was not going to involve Britain in any loss of essential national sovereignty – a lie he admitted smirkingly on television just a few years back? Did the Tories not lie equally on immigration throughout the years in which they were in power and the Third World flood into this country continued unabated?

If ‘extremism’ is the alternative to government lies and unending incompetence, perhaps it is time for the British public to engage in an objective examination of this ‘extremism’ and consider whether it might be the only way to our salvation!

They keep on coming!

Newspapers in the earlier part of September showed pictures of an immigrant centre just over the Channel in Calais, where there stood a queue of Third Worlders lining up for food handouts. Reports said that hundreds of them were massing at the French port, and that they had one very clear objective: to get to Britain.

Their presence at Calais had a very simple explanation. The previous immigrant centre just down the road at Sangatte had been closed down – to whoops of self-congratulation by the Blair Government due to its role in persuading the French to adopt that measure. All common sense at the time dictated that this would achieve absolutely nothing, as the would-be immigrants would just congregate somewhere else across the water and try from there.

And so it has been proved.

This has been reported as a big blow to Home Secretary David Blunkett, who had claimed that the closure of Sangatte was going to help to reduce the numbers trying to get into Britain. Of course this was nonsense, and we are pretty sure that Blunkett knew it

Spearhead

No. 416 OCTOBER 2003
PO Box 2471, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 4DT
Editor: John Tyndall

Spearhead exists to reflect a cross-section of contemporary British Nationalist opinion. It is privately published by its editor and is independent of all political parties and groups.

Unless it is specifically stated otherwise, the views expressed in signed articles or letters in *Spearhead* are the sole responsibility of their writers and should not be taken as representing the views of the Editor or the policies of any political organisation that *Spearhead* may support editorially.

Spearhead welcomes enquiries from prospective advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. Advertising matter, accompanied by pre-payment, must be submitted at least one month prior to the publishing date (normally the first day of the month) of the issue for which the advertisement is intended. The Editor reserves the right to refuse, without giving reasons, to publish any advertisement submitted. The appearance of an advertisement in *Spearhead* does not necessarily indicate that the Editor has any knowledge of, interest in or support for the product, service, organisation or function being advertised.

The Editor is pleased to receive from readers manuscripts for articles for possible publication. The most useful lengths are of around 1,000 to 1,850 words. *Spearhead* is currently produced using Serif PagePlus 6 software. Articles sent on 3.5" computer disk will be welcome if compatible. To ensure acceptance, however, they should also be sent in printed or typewritten format. No payment is made for articles published, which become *Spearhead* copyright unless the writers specifically request otherwise. The Editor reserves the right to shorten or in any other way amend articles submitted for publication.

Those wishing to reprint *Spearhead* articles in other publications should ensure when doing so to give public acknowledgement to both the writer and *Spearhead* and to include in the acknowledgement the magazine’s full address.

was nonsense. It was just another of those desperate protestations that government ministers feel themselves under compulsion to make on an almost day-to-day basis to dampen public fury at the immigrant flood. We are getting them all the time, and they amount to nothing more than stale gimmickry. Few believe them any more, as few believe anything the Government says.

The reality is that this Government does not have the slightest intention of doing anything to stop immigration. On the contrary, it is doing everything it can to encourage and promote it. Labour is the slave and executor of an agenda, hatched by very powerful people at a global level, to mix up the world's populations so as to render national identity no longer viable. It is happening in the United States, as politicians stand paralytic in the face of a flood of migrants across the country's southern border. It is happening elsewhere in Europe, as migrants pour into Germany, France, Holland, Belgium and the Scandinavian countries. But nowhere is it happening at quite the same terrifying level as in Britain. And nowhere else – apart perhaps from the Benelux countries – is there the same pressure of the invaders on living space, as the South East of England becomes increasingly concreted over to provide new towns for the immigrants – or for natives in existing towns who are getting out to make way for the immigrants, as is the case in London, Birmingham, Bristol and elsewhere.

And immigrants themselves are admitting that the UK is the favourite target because of the soft touch we have become. Giving evidence last month to a parliamentary enquiry, many of them testified how this country had offered them a warm welcome after they had been given short shrift in other parts of Europe. One Afghan asylum-seeker told the enquiry that the police in Greece had thrown him and some of his compatriots in jail, that in Italy they had sworn at them but that when they got to Dover the 'Old Bill' had treated them "in the best possible way."

Of one thing we can be sure: if this is actually how our police are reacting to the immigrant invasion it does not reflect how the ordinary copper feels but must be the consequence of intense pressure on the lower ranks of officers imposed by their superiors, who all know that their routes to promotion are littered with politically correct signposts, and that they dare not do other than lay out the red carpet to the newcomers if they want to get on in the force.

The parties of the political establishment, of 'orthodoxy' and 'moderation', have simply abdicated their responsibility to protect the nation's borders and to safeguard Britain's identity. They are all falling over each other to court the ethnic minority vote, and in the

process are completely abandoning any duty to the British people and their future descendants.

That is why more and more voters are turning to the 'extremism' which the leader writer of the *Daily Mail* seems to fear. Well, let us paraphrase Senator Barry Goldwater, one-time US presidential candidate, and say that extremism in defence of our country is no dishonourable thing.

Dr. Kiosk is alive and well!

Britain's academic community – or at least some of its most active zealots – continue to dwell in a world increasingly divorced from reason and common sense. Following a study carried out by the University of Brighton, a paper was issued last month uttering dire warnings about the 'institutional racism' still prevalent in many of our educational centres. According to a report in *The Observer* of the 14th September, the study drew upon findings compiled by the University of Sussex and Canterbury Christchurch University College as well as Brighton University itself, and its conclusions were that "covert racism exists almost everywhere."

The report went on to state that Dr. Mike Coles, termed "a specialist in equality and racist issues" (whatever that may mean), "is calling upon [Home Secretary] Blunkett to introduce the 'minimalist recommendations' of the Macpherson enquiry into the murder of [Stephen] Lawrence." And of the recommendations it said:-

"These include empowering local education authorities to create and enforce anti-racist policies through codes of practice and amending the National Curriculum to raise awareness of xenophobia..."

And:-

"In appearing to mark a retreat from the Government's commitment to the implementation of these most minimalist recommendations, David Blunkett's remarks denying the existence of institutional racism have a sinister ring."

"In the light of escalating racism, Islamophobia and xeno-racism, in Britain, mainland Europe and worldwide, the mandatory implementation of measures to undermine institutional racism is more urgent than ever."

Those who have laughed at the nutty professor Dr. Heinz Kiosk in *The Daily Telegraph's* 'Peter Simple' column might perhaps come to believe that this fictional character of satire is now close to being overtaken by reality in the insane world of British academia of our times. Just who is this Dr. Coles? Is he real? Who pays him? Just what is his purpose? And how many more of his type are there in our citadels of higher edu-

cation?

And with such people on the loose is it any wonder Britain is becoming a nation of educated morons?

Hollywood and the Battle of Britain

We've seen it all before: GI Errol Flynn conquering Burma single-handed; Private Ryan in a Normandy invasion in which Brits seemed almost wholly absent. Now there's going to be a film with Tom Cruise playing the part of an heroic American flyer in the Battle of Britain – with perhaps a little help from some of the locals.

Some newspaper writers have complained that this is all in keeping with an attitude of American chauvinism, but that misses the point that Hollywood is not controlled by Americans. For a long time, the czars of the US-based movie industry have been men dominated by two considerations. One is to make as much money as possible. The other is to further, not an American nationalist agenda, but a Jewish one. Any chauvinism resident in Hollywood is a Jewish chauvinism.

But where making money is concerned, the most immediate and biggest market for Hollywood's products is the market in the United States. Americans like to watch films that make them feel good about themselves, and what's wrong about that? If exaggerating their parents' and grandparents' role in winning World War II is a way to do this, you can hardly blame the film-producers for taking the opportunity.

But when it comes to people in Britain complaining about this, what they should really be complaining about is the way in which a situation has been allowed in where American films dominate our cinema and TV screens. That's our fault, not the fault of American movie audiences, nor the fault of the film moguls who cater for them.

Crusading against world poverty again!

Labour leaders, including Trade Secretary Patricia Hewitt, Environment Secretary Margaret Beckett and International Development Secretary Baroness Amos, enjoyed a four-day junket last month at a luxury resort in Cancun, Mexico. The purpose? To discuss how to relieve world poverty!

The British delegation stayed at the Fiesta Americana Grand Coral Beach Hotel, a five-star establishment where a bottle of Chateau Lafite Rothschild costs £400. The full cost of travel and accommodation alone is likely to have cost the British taxpayer over £50,000.

Isn't it good to know that we have politicians who really care about the deprived and the hungry!

The Tory demise is our opportunity

LAST MONTH'S by-election in Brent East hammered home, yet again, the reality of the disastrous spiral of decline and degeneration into which Britain's Tories have fallen.

The party managed a pathetic 3,368 votes – 16 per cent of the poll. In keeping with their carefully cultivated 'liberal' and 'inclusive' image, they fielded an Asian candidate. It didn't do them much good; they were soundly beaten by both the Liberal Democrats and Labour.

In two local government by-elections in September the Tories were well trounced by the British National Party. In the Grays Riverside ward of Thurrock (Essex) they managed 382 votes beside the BNP's 552. In the Abbey Green ward of Stoke-on-Trent the score was BNP 782; Conservative 249.

Yet none of this is likely to divert Tory leader Iain Duncan Smith from his policy of 'softening down'. At a two-day conference in London in mid-September he affirmed his belief in the necessity for an image of 'compassionate Conservatism' – not in itself an objectionable concept but one which, in current Tory jargon, unmistakably translates as more friendly to ethnic minorities, homosexuals and drug-takers while being bland and muted on immigration. With regard to the war against Iraq, the Tories had a golden opportunity to distance themselves from Labour by declaring a policy of no military engagements except in Britain's interest. But they fluffed even this, meekly trotting along on the heels of Tony Blair and his US and globalist masters.

In short, the Tories wholly deserve their current electoral flops.

OUR BIG CHANCE

But in their failure lies an unparalleled opportunity for Nationalism.

And this is something foreseen and foretold in these very columns back in January 1992 in an article by our editor titled 'Recognising the Ultimate Enemy'. The theme of this article was that it was the Tory Party, much more than Labour or the Liberal Democrats, which stood in the way of the emergence of a nationalist mass-movement of the kind that had risen in some countries in Continental Europe; and to underline this the writer quoted extensively from an article which had appeared in *The Independent on Sunday* three weeks earlier. This article, written by Neil Ascherson, endeavoured to explain the slowness of the white nationalist backlash in Britain by comparison with those else-

where. In Britain, said Ascherson, the Tory Party had always acted as a buffer and safety-valve for popular protest of the kind which, in France for instance, had been channelled into support for Jean-Marie Le Pen. This is how he described it:-

"But Britain's most effective protection against the far right – fascist or merely radical – has been the Conservative party. This was true in the Oswald Mosley period. And it has stayed true until now.

"There is a polite way to put this, and a rude way. The polite way is to say that the Conservative party has been right-wing but also democratic. It is a selfish party of 'haves', but (as Mrs.

Thatcher's fall showed) it believes in parliamentary politics rather than populism. The rude way is to say that the Conservative Party has been democratic but also exceedingly right-wing. Why vote for Mosley or Colin Jordan when you can vote for Enoch Powell or Norman Tebbit?

"This is the 'Mithradates Formula', named after the king who drank poison in tiny doses until he grew immune to it. A conservative party which pinches a few extremist slogans can steal the ultra-right vote without doing itself much damage. This is what Konrad Adenauer did in post-war Germany. He saw that Nazism had triumphed largely because of the disunity of the right in the Weimar Republic. So his Christian Democratic Union was a coalition in which Catholics and social market liberals mingled with nationalist fanatics and a few scandalous ex-Nazis. The result was that none of the countless right-radical or neo-Nazi revivals ever kept much of a vote. Their followers voted CDU instead."

John Tyndall, writing in *Spearhead*, commented on this as follows:-

"The message here is clear enough... The Conservatives, and their counterparts in Germany, have for many years 'conned' their respective electorates by adopting 'nationalist' postures just plausible enough to divert votes away from genuinely patriotic parties but never substantial enough to commit them to carrying out policies which fulfil the hopes of the voters in question."

To return to Ascherson, that writer expanded on his theme by bringing things more up to date. Speaking of the Tories at that time (just under 12 years ago), he

described the legacy the party had inherited as a result of these duplicitous tactics, thus:-

"The reality is a coalition ranging from mild social democrats to people whose opinions on race, nation and obedience are frankly fascist. In rhetoric, however, the party has affected an increasingly steep tilt to the right. Groups such as the Monday Club have always kept doors open to the right-radical underworld. But in the Thatcher years even the leadership pretended to hold Mussolinian opinions on matters such as war, 'socialism', welfare scroungers and immigration. (Few apart from the leader really believed all this, and those who did were out of the Cabinet by the time she fell).

"Mrs. Thatcher, as Mithradates, made ultra-right politics pointless for 12 years. But now things may change. Conservative rhetoric has swung back leftwards to the party's centre of gravity... Meanwhile the factors which could nourish the far-right – middle class insecurity, myths of national 'betrayal', economic failure – remain fertile. If a weaker Tory Government emerges from the next elections, there could be a rapid upsurge of semi-fascist politics in Britain. By European measures it will be last. But it may well not be least."

PRESCIENT

Ascherson's words were intriguingly prescient. Of course, being a paid-up member of the left-liberal media élite, he might have been expected to have attached the labels of 'Nazi', 'Fascist' or 'semi-fascist' of anything suggestive of nationalist sentiment. However, that is a detail which we can pass by in looking at his main message. It is a message the only imprecision of which lies in its time-scale – or lack of it. Ascherson may have anticipated the 'rapid upsurge' of which he spoke as something that would come a little more quickly. That we are now starting to see it well over a decade after his words were written is something that can be put down to the imponderable and unpredictable pace of national events.

The 'leftward swing' in the Tory Party of which Ascherson spoke has now gone so far as to reach the point of no return. At the same time, the party's credibility has sunk so low that its electoral rating is heading for the pits. This indeed is the moment of destiny for British Nationalism!

The things they're saying

... the Tories remain Eeyorish and depressed. We can't win next time, they say. Maybe in 2009, if we're lucky. Unless they are intimate friends of Mr. Duncan Smith, they tend to grumble in private about him and assume that he will never lead them to victory. You will not often encounter in this life such a group of broken-backed, gutless, half-baked moaning minnies as there are in the modern Tory Party.

STEPHEN GLOVER
Daily Mail (9.9.03)

Most of the people who work for the BBC belong, of course, to the Left-Liberal tendency. They do not think they are biased. They think they are right. They have the opinions which, they believe, are held by all people with any intelligence or decent feeling.

They think that any apparently intelligent or decent people who do not share these opinions are either mad or wicked or perversely pretending to be so. As for the rest, they are simply stupid.

PETER SIMPLE
The Daily Telegraph (19.9.03)

Does anyone really believe that the Government's decision to join the war in Iraq was an independent one, based on real intelligence of an immediate threat; or a selfless campaign fought on behalf of an oppressed people? The fact is, the justification for this grubby little war has changed so many times that nobody is inclined to believe any of the official lines.

And, of course, on the very morning the Prime Minister is due to give evidence to the Hutton Inquiry, along comes a populist pledge on asylum policy, with Tony Blair's name stapled to every reference.

Faced with such unashamed cynicism from those in power, is it any wonder that many of us regard turning up to a polling station every five years to be as pathetic an act as any citizen can indulge in?

DAVID AVITAL
Letter in The Independent (29.8.03)

Presenter Adrian Chiles looks almost lost for words as he walks through Granby Street, Toxteth, in a thought-provoking documentary.

Almost, but not quite.

He says: "I always used to go around and say inter-marrying would eventually solve all the problems."

But that theory, he says, was destroyed in Liverpool.

After being told... that Liverpool's non-white community was a mixed-race community, Adrian said: "As for all that stuff about more mixed-race marriages being the answer, Liverpool 8 gives the lie to the whole idea."

EXTRACTS FROM THE MAINSTREAM MEDIA

And if it's not going to happen in Liverpool, he asked, where else is it going to happen?

At the end of his tour, Adrian says: "My point that if everyone cross-bred then we would all eventually be the same colour and there would be no racism is nonsense."

REPORT BY PADDY SHENNAN
Liverpool Echo (20.8.03)

The National Grid says it is not under-investment but simply 'circumstances' that caused the chaotic power-cut during the London rush hour on Thursday night.

Sadly, it was a further demonstration in this country of how nothing works – our hospitals, our schools, our transport system, you name it. Money is not always the answer: it is the aptitude, intelligence and leadership of those who manage these operations. Sadly, in a country long accustomed to settling for second best, and resigning itself to mediocrity, you often end up by getting the public services you have come to expect.

SIMON HEFFER
Daily Mail (30.8.03)

How ironic that it's New Labour introducing a test for immigrants on what it means to be British.

Since it came to power in 1997, this Government has done its utmost to destroy any concept of Britishness.

It has tried to tear up the past, to rubbish or ignore our history, to destroy the whole concept of Britain.

Labour has built on 30 years of post-colonial, guilt-ridden propaganda in schools, universities, broadcasting and the left-wing media.

RICHARD LITTLEJOHN
The Sun (5.9.03)

All kinds of perversities have sprung up under multi-culturalism. There is reverse racism, of black against white, and of white people intimidated into agreeing that they cannot understand black people and are institutionally racist. There is a strange kind of modern *apartheid*...

Multi-culturalism in Britain has actually promoted the idea that different standards apply to children of different cultures and that things which would be unacceptable for white children might be okay for black children.

MINETTE MARRIN
The Sunday Times (7.9.03)

We are constantly told that importing other cultures is enriching our country and that multi-culturalism is to be applauded. Unfortunately, nothing could be further from the

truth. It could be suggested that what we are doing is importing alien cultures whose leaders, the imams and others, are determined that their people will be ruled by the religious practices of the 11th and 12th centuries and who will not recognise secular government and, in some cases, the law of the land.

B. WYLIE
Letter in The Times (9.9.03)

Journalism is not an extension of a creative writing course. Some young reporters, with their Firsts from Balliol, think that they have entered a respectable profession, and believe that it is possible to be an effective journalist and a perfect gentlemen. It isn't. Anyone who treats a journalist as an entirely normal person because he (or she) appears clever and well-spoken and decent should have his head examined. Journalists really are a different species, and they and members of the much larger species that comprises normal humanity should never forget it.

STEPHEN GLOVER
The Spectator (6.9.03)

When Michael Meacher, a former Labour minister of the environment, wrote in *The Guardian* to suggest that the American Government had not done everything it could to prevent 9/11 and had even welcomed it as a pretext for its drive for 'world domination', he found some of the readers writing in to say they agreed with him and that everybody knew it was true anyhow.

At this, Meacher drew back, protesting that he had not meant anything of the sort. With his innocently gleaming spectacles and bright, smiling eco-environmental rambler's face, this exponent of green thinking and cosy sustainability must have realised with dismay that he had wandered onto quaking ground and unwittingly plied *Guardian* readers with thoughts they hardly dared to acknowledge to themselves.

When Meacher and his readers, so reasonable and well-meaning, begin to talk of 'world domination', they must know that 'world conspiracy' is not far away and that the Elders of Zion are lurking somewhere about. How Meacher must have wished he had never started it!

PETER SIMPLE
The Daily Telegraph (19.9.03)

If criticism of Israel, however brutal or unfair, is construed as anti-Semitism, then this must represent a grave failure for Zionism. No one cries 'racist' at the fiercest critics of Ireland or Pakistan. Why is Israel different?

GEOFFREY WHEATCROFT
The Observer (7.9.03)

- **PARANOIA**
- **PERSONAL ATTACKS**
- **ACCUSATIONS OF 'SUBVERSION'**
- **EXPULSIONS**
- **PURGES**

We've been here before!

TO BE EXACT, we were here 17 years ago. The year was 1986. The British National Party was four years old. The National Front, the party out of which it was formed, was racked by chronic internal divisions, with accusations and counter-accusations, personal attacks and demands for expulsions poisoning the air. Does it sound familiar? It should, because there is a certain common thread linking that time with times much more recent.


It was in 1986 that the NF split in two. One morning, nationalists in Britain woke up to find that there were now two organisations claiming to be the National Front where previously there had been one: there was the 'Official' National Front, led by Nick Griffin and Derek Holland; and there was what came to be known as the National Front 'Support Group', of which the main leaders appear to have been Martin Wingfield and Ian Anderson. There is some irony in this because the former gentleman is now one of the leading lieutenants of Mr. Griffin in today's BNP!

Inevitably, both sides in the conflict issued their respective versions of what had gone wrong and who was to blame. Those of us by then in the BNP smiled as we watched these two factions screech at each other like alley cats, each seeking to outdo the other in mutual recrimination. Of course, we took no sides. Long ago, we had come to view the NF as a party with no future, albeit that it still contained some good patriots at rank-and-file and lower leadership levels. With the individuals at the top, a clash had always been probable, and it was no surprise when it came.

HYSTERICAL AND NUTTY

Neither version of what had happened impressed us, but of the two the version issued in the name of the 'Official' Front seemed by several degrees the more vituperative, paranoid, hysterical and plain nutty. It was titled *Attempted Murder: the State/Reactionary Plot Against the National Front*. From this choice of words it will be gleaned that the 'Official' NF regarded its internal opponents as hirelings

of the political establishment, whose mission was to sabotage the party from the inside. Our own view at the time was that there was probably some truth in this but it was only half



Issued in 1986, this publication tells us a great deal about what is wrong in the British National Party.

the truth; the likelihood was that the establishment had its agents placed in both camps, with the intention that through action and counter-action from one direction and then another the NF would be smashed to pieces. Effectively it was, though a rump of it has managed to survive to this day.

Attempted Murder in due course took its place among the piles of mostly forgotten factional literature that have gathered dust in attics, cellars, spare bedrooms and garages over the years – just occasionally retrieved and read for amusement and for old time's sake. Certain recent events, however, brought

SPEARHEAD
asks: does this old document contain the clue to the recent troubles in the BNP?

memories of it back, and we acquired a copy for study. The study was well worthwhile, and the document is highly recommended to those who seek to make sense of what has been happening in the BNP, our own party, over the past few years. We too are deeply divided within – though successes on the electoral scene should, from every commonsense standpoint, be making us more united than ever, while other nationalist groups should be abandoning their own separate operations and joining us. Why is there this division? Let us turn to *Attempted Murder*, and see if it offers some clues.

In the introduction to the document it is made clear that, though it was unanimously approved by the National Directorate of the National Front, its author was in fact Nick Griffin, who as a consequence of the split had emerged as leader of the party.

'DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNALS'

We do not have to proceed very far in *Attempted Murder* before something of its flavour emerges. In the third paragraph of the Introduction it is stated that:-

"The facts about the State's response to the growing NF threat, and the part played in it by the last reactionary elements within the old leadership, have taken a long time to uncover. And the need to ensure fair trials for these few individuals at their resulting disciplinary tribunals has prevented previous publication of the full story about the rise and fall of their factional adventure."

It is at this point that we should explain that throughout the document Mr. Griffin's opponents in the NF are described as the 'reactionaries' and his own faction as the 'radicals'. The division, in other words, is over matters of ideology and principle, and has nothing to do with human egos, personal ambitions or power-rivalries. Make sure you understand this!

Fair trials for individuals at disciplinary tribunals! Does this not sound faintly familiar? In the next paragraph members are assured that the offending individuals – termed 'ring-leaders' – have now been expelled. Familiar again?

What follows is a depressing tale of organisational incompetence within the party, with one individual after another being blamed for this. In fact, when one tots up the names of the people who are accused of incompetence and/or bad personal habits and/or dishonourable or subversive behaviour the list reads like a roll call of just about everyone who was

anyone in the NF at the time. There is one notable exception among these names, and that is Nick Griffin himself. None of the blame for the long catalogue of cock-ups is Nick's; it is all other people's fault. And, needless to say, Nick remains a beacon of honourable behaviour while so many other people are acting dishonourably!

The tale takes a kind of diary form, with commentaries recorded against the months in which things happened. The first such entry is for December 1983. Here it is stated that "a meeting of the National Directorate voted to expel [Martin] Webster and his homosexual lover Michael Salt from all their paid and elected positions within the party." Now that really is interesting – because not so very long previously Mr. Griffin had been one of those in the NF who had opposed John Tyndall's move to have Mr. Webster dismissed on the grounds of his homosexuality! This sounds a rather Damascan conversion, but no doubt Mr. Griffin will be able to explain it – as he usually has an explanation for everything.

In the same section Martin Wingfield is accused of trying to obstruct the dismissal of Webster in the first place but changing his mind when he was offered the editorship of the party's newspaper, then called *National Front News*.

The narrative proceeds to August 1984, in which section Tom Acton, Ian Anderson and Roger Denny are all attacked. There is an argument over the location of a party printing machine, which, according to Mr. Griffin, Anderson wanted to be in East London "which he saw as his own personal power-base." Following on from this, in a section dated April 1985, Anderson is accused of lying to his close associates. The next thing is that the same Mr. Anderson is as good as accused of financial impropriety.

EVERYONE IS GUILTY EXCEPT NICK!

Needless to say, we have no way whatever of knowing whether any of these accusations are justified or not. It is just that virtually everyone who had been, or currently was, a colleague of Nick Griffin gets accused of something. Needless to say, Nick comes out of every encounter with clean hands!

It is the same in a section which follows, dated July 1985. In this section we read about a long succession of cock-ups. Money has been handled irresponsibly, if not dishonestly. Large numbers of letters to the party office have gone unanswered. Stocks of books have run down while orders have not been dealt with. Leaflets have been produced far too late and have been of poor quality. A printing press has been purchased which is quite useless, while the motive for its purchase is deemed as factional. There are more attacks on Anderson, Wingfield and Denny in this connection. There is even a snide reference to rivalries over lady friends affecting the performance of party duties – something more appropriate to the gossip column of a tabloid newspaper than a bulletin dealing with serious business in a political party.

Next target for attack is one Michael Hipperson. Yes, he too has incurred Mr. Griffin's displeasure. Mr. Hipperson is accused of failing to deliver photos of an NF march for the party's paper and also neglecting to pursue follow-ups – with what justification we have no way of knowing. He simply joins Mr. Griffin's 'hit list' and is thought to be part of the rival faction because he shares accommodation with Anderson. It gets more and more complicated!

While all these misdeeds and failures of duty were occurring, what, the reader might ask, was Nick Griffin himself doing? Of course, as always, he is not to blame! The failures were other people's. However, Nick has an explanation for the chaos that seems to have been endemic in the party. It is not just incompetence; it is worse than that; it is deliberate sabotage! At the end of the July 1985 section he announces that those he is attacking are doing it all "in order to discredit their radical colleagues..." In other words, it's a conspiracy, folks!

The attacks continue. One person out of favour is accused of being into drugs. Another is too fond of his beer.

THE HIT LIST GROWS

There next appear accusations of a leak to *The Guardian* newspaper over a printing operation. As with so much else, it is impossible 17 years afterwards to get to the truth of what actually happened. Ian Anderson, by now very clearly enemy number one, is believed to be the culprit; however Wingfield and Acton are attacked again, this time for obstructing charges against Anderson being brought on the Directorate. And they are joined by two more: Andrew Brons and Paul Nash. All are accused of scheming, lying and rigging the Directorate agenda to get Anderson off the hook. Mr. Griffin claims that they have been doing so "to protect a member of their secret faction," and that they are therefore 'corrupt'. Four more to be added to the hit list.

Coming to the Autumn of 1985, the attacks on Anderson continue. There are allegations of theft, fraud, drunkenness and incompetence, but that is not all; again the theme of 'deliberate sabotage' reappears, and again Wingfield and Brons, among others, are accused of shielding Anderson – no doubt as part of the factional conspiracy!

It is known that at some time during those years Ian Anderson was in fact chairman of the NF Directorate and therefore in effect leader of the party, though *Attempted Murder* is extremely imprecise as to when he took over this position and when he vacated it. At all events, throughout the time he was most definitely part of the NF's hierarchy. If his sins were so glaring as Mr. Griffin makes them out to be, it seems incredible that *anyone* in senior party circles should have failed to be aware of them and support the appropriate action against him. Yet he appeared to have several defenders at the very top of the party. Why? Perhaps these defenders knew a few things that are not made obvious in *Attempted Murder*.

Next to come in for condemnation is Miss

Tina Dalton; she joins the lengthening list of guilty persons. She is accused of inefficiency as a typesetter but it is hinted that in this capacity she did some jobs for Anderson for factional reasons. Miss Dalton later became Mrs. Denny and, subsequent to that, Mrs. Wingfield, which we understand she remains today. Mr. Wingfield, for his part, is now editor of the BNP paper *The Voice of Freedom*, as most people know. This suggests an extraordinarily forgiving attitude on his part towards Nick Griffin – or should we put that the other way round?

GUTTER PRESS TACTICS

Interspersed with these attacks against all and sundry, we find in the section headed January 1986 a reference to certain sensitive papers being found in an office and destroyed as part of a security operation. Apparently not all of the papers were of a political nature, and here Mr. Griffin again descends to a piece of bitchiness worthy only of a low-grade female gossip columnist, talking about certain personal diaries and love letters that should never be regarded as party business. He is at it again a page later, insinuating an 'affair' between a member and another member's wife when the husband was unavoidably away. This is gutter stuff which we could well do without.

Next to incur disfavour is one Steve Brady, whom some readers will know. Brady apparently sent a letter to Joe Pearce, now (Spring 1986) in Prison, which contained sensitive information liable to be read by the prison censors. This was foolish but hardly a hanging offence. Nevertheless it is stated that "The Directorate took a dim view of this and Brady ended up on a charge." It is not stated who actually moved that there should be such a charge but the reader will perhaps have little trouble in guessing! Brady is described as having letters of support from Wingfield, Brons, Acton and Dalton – which presumably means that these people did not consider his letter to Pearce sufficiently serious for disciplinary action. Says Griffin: "Most of the key figures in the subsequent faction leapt to Brady's defence, so they had already clearly transferred their loyalties from the National Front as a whole to members of their own clique." Much more likely, they simply regarded a disciplinary punishment against Brady as ridiculous and could see that it was being pursued in a fit of paranoia that could not be countenanced. Here Pearce, up to now not on the hit list, incurs disfavour by sending a letter out from prison which appears to defend Brady. Obviously, Pearce must from now on be watched!

Northern Ireland becomes the next battleground for Mr. Griffin's factional war. A loyalist by the name of Keith White gets killed by a bullet from an RUC rifle during a demonstration against the Anglo-Irish Agreement – probably no more than a tragic accident. However, in the minds of Nick's 'radical' wing of the NF it becomes 'murder'. In retaliation for the death, some loyalists in the province make petrol-bomb attacks on the homes of RUC

Contd. overleaf

WE'VE BEEN HERE BEFORE!

(Contd. from prev. page)

officers – an utterly inexcusable action, whatever the natural anger prompting it. And what do Griffin & Co. in the NF do? They make a declaration which as good as justifies the attackers! Wingfield condemns this declaration, and is in consequence himself condemned by the so-called 'radicals' in the NF, presumably including Nick Griffin. Another mark against Wingfield!

ABOUT-TURN ON STREET CONFRONTATION

Following this, there is further condemnation of Wingfield for his opposition to a policy of 'direct physical confrontation' by the NF against marches by IRA supporters. It is not the time nor place here to enter into this argument, save to remark that Mr. Griffin, who clearly then approved of these tactics, has now done a 180° turn and throws the 'street-confrontation' charge against his opponents in the BNP, alleging that they favour it!

After more tirades against Wingfield (his ally these days, remember), Mr. Griffin turns to the satirical writer the late Ted Budden, whose columns in nationalist papers gave great entertainment to many nationalists. Ted is accused of "reactionary and juvenile race-hate rantings" and called "an elderly bigot." One more on the hit list! Ironically, Nick was pleased later to accept Ted Budden's humorous contributions to the BNP newspaper before the latter died at the end of 2000.

But we are not finished with the tirades against Wingfield. They continue at some length, and at one point Griffin writes: "Wingfield's 'Mr. Nice Guy' image conceals an arrogant self-importance and lust for power of shocking proportions." Phew!

But none of this should sidetrack us from the fact that Anderson continues to be the number-one enemy. It is all now building up to the disciplinary action against him intended to hound him out of the party. No prizes are being offered for correctly guessing who is bringing the charges!

Of course, anyone disposed to disagree with this action is branded an 'enemy' too, with prominence in this regard given to Wingfield and Acton. Wingfield is accused here, as elsewhere, of having 'Tory' tendencies. Brons, out of things for some time, is attacked for opposing the action against Anderson.


Recently *Spearhead* has spoken to some of the people around at this time to get their views on the situation. They are unanimous in saying that, although Anderson had many weaknesses and faults, they believed that the attempt to bring disciplinary charges against him to drive him out of the party was utterly ridiculous; hence their opposition to it. One witness has testified to the paranoid way in which anyone who opposed these charges was lumped together with Anderson as part of some imaginary 'conspiracy' against the party.

We now come to the Directorate meeting at which Anderson is intended for the chop. Here an extraordinary admission is made of which the reader should take careful note.

Steve Brady, who in this section again comes in for much stick, is accused of making a false claim to the effect that Griffin had told him that Anderson was about to be expelled on 'trumped up' charges. Brady, it will be recalled, was already in hot water over his letter to Pearce. Here Nick's version of what actually happened is spelled out. This is now Nick Griffin speaking, not someone else putting words into his mouth. Bear in mind that he (Nick) writes of himself throughout *Attempted Murder* in the third person, and he writes as follows:-

"For all his faults, Brady was considered quite radical and was a drinking mate of Pearce's, so Nick had told him on the 'phone that his recent short suspension was the end of the affair of his indiscreet letter to Pearce, and had made it clear that Wingfield's attitude made it necessary to expel Anderson. He went on to tell him that there were so many genuine charges against him that his removal was assured, but that no one else would be touched as long as they didn't move to support his corruption..."

His removal was assured! Readers will perhaps find here an eerie foretaste of later events and declarations. As for the promise that no one else would be touched, this sounds



IAN ANDERSON

Griffin was obsessed with driving him out of the NF, and anyone who opposed this was accused of being 'subversive'.

very much like: "Support my action – or else!" Here again, future events seem to cast their shadow. When in July of this year Mr. Griffin was phoning around the country urging people to support the planned expulsion of John Tyndall he was making similar threats to those who showed insufficient enthusiasm for the idea, in the case of BNP town councillors hinting at the withdrawal of the party whip from them if they did not endorse Tyndall's dismissal.

In the outcome, the motion to bring charges against Anderson, which was put by Griffin, was defeated by one vote. There follows in the document a list of the diabolically subversive practices employed to achieve

this result, as part of which, again, nearly everybody is attacked, but Wingfield in particular comes in for very heavy punishment, being accused of manipulating the whole proceedings. At the same meeting a new party Executive is elected, leaving Wingfield as chairman and Griffin as his deputy. This does not seem a recipe for future harmony, and it isn't.

ACCUSATIONS OF CORRUPTION

Nick is not finished with Wingfield. There follows in *Attempted Murder* a two-page section headed 'Wingfield's Corruption', which makes it all the more amazing that Wingfield and Griffin are now colleagues and the latter is able to write glowing tributes to Wingfield's skills as a journalist and propagandist. The whole affair of 1983-86 involving Griffin and Wingfield leaves two questions begging. If Griffin's assessment of Wingfield's character as shown in *Attempted Murder* is correct, how on earth can he now embrace him as a senior colleague in the BNP? Alternatively, if the assessment is just malicious fabrication, how on earth can Wingfield accept with any honour a job that involves working under Griffin?

The new party Executive, according to Mr. Griffin, consists of six persons, namely Martin Wingfield, Andrew Brons, Paul Nash, Tom Acton, Joe Pearce and Griffin himself. If what he has written in *Attempted Murder* is correct, this leaves Nick in a minority of one – at least with regard to his current obsession of driving Ian Anderson out of the party. It will not require too much perception on the part of the reader to appreciate that Nick was none too pleased.

At this point it should be explained that the National Directorate remained the senior authority in the NF; the Executive was merely a body appointed by the Directorate to make quick day-to-day decisions that could not await the next scheduled Directorate meeting. Thus appointed, the Executive could likewise be dismissed.

And this is what Mr. Griffin now sets about planning. According to the account in *Attempted Murder*, he manages, by energetic and persuasive lobbying of Directorate members, to obtain a majority, albeit not a large one, for the dismissal of the Executive he dislikes and the appointing of a new one. Readers will not be overwhelmed with surprise to hear that the new chairman of the Executive, Directorate and party is – Nick Griffin!

According to his own account (and corroborated by others), Nick now sets about pursuing the expulsion from the party of his main opponents and rivals. The pretext is a bulletin issued by these people which is claimed to reveal confidential minutes of a Directorate meeting, but to put spice on things the offenders are also accused of telling lies and making attacks on Nick and his supporters. And that's not all. To quote *Attempted Murder*, "additional charges of disloyalty were also brought."

The four arch-criminals, namely Wingfield, Brons, Nash and Acton, are duly

expelled from the party. One of our current witnesses who was there at the time has opined that the four had a pretty strong case for challenging the expulsions in court, but were put off the idea by the thought of the expense involved. It seems from *Attempted Murder* that there were additional purges, but the document is not too specific about which individuals were affected. Somehow the ghost of Joseph Stalin makes a fleeting appearance here.

Attempted Murder rambles on for many more pages the details of which it would be tedious to reproduce here. Briefly, what next transpired was that the sacked people refused to recognise their expulsions and set about creating their own organisation. They called it the 'National Front Support Group', claiming that their loyalty was still to the party though not to its existing leadership. For a while, Britain witnessed the absurdity of two 'National Fronts' operating quite separately from each other, each claiming to be the authentic representative of the original party.

GRIFFIN SUPPORT SLIPS AWAY

Nick Griffin, in *Attempted Murder*, claims that his faction, the 'Official' Front enjoyed the support of a very clear majority in the party. This may have been correct at the time it was written (1986) but it ceased to be so before very long. A year later, the rival faction had become indisputably stronger. Mr. Griffin's supporters deserted him in droves.



Griffin is seen here (left) with Derek Holland when the two visited Libya to solicit funds from Colonel Gaddafi

Some joined the other 'National Front'. Some went to the BNP. Some dropped out of nationalist politics altogether. Griffin's Front and Wingfield's Front measured strengths against each other at the Remembrance Day parade in November 1987, and the latter was seen to be at least four times more numerous.

Eventually, the Griffin Front disintegrated entirely, leaving the Wingfield Front as the sole claimant to the party's title. The National Front of today is the heir to that party.

In years following, nationalists in Britain were to witness more political turns by Mr. Griffin. Soon after the 1986 split there came the 'Cadre' National Front (so named as a result of Nick's organising of an elite 'party within the party' which enjoyed a superior status to the ordinary membership and thus thoroughly and predictably alienated the

latter). Then there was the 'Gaddafi' Front, a nickname earned by the adoption of the doctrines of the eccentric Libyan dictator. The most notable event in the short career of this body was an unsuccessful visit by Griffin and Derek Holland to Libya to solicit money. There followed the era of the 'Political Soldiers', another Griffin stunt modelled on the example of Rumanian Iron Guard leader Corneliu Codreanu. Later Nick became involved with the International Third Position, but this did not last long. For information on his contribution to the ITP, the reader is best advised to contact one of its leading officers, Mr. Gareth Hurley.

We come then to the early to mid-1990s, when we find Nick making overtures to the BNP, which some years previously he had been regularly attacking. But that is another story.

We now hear that copies of Attempted Murder are again in circulation, though Spearhead has had nothing to do with this development. We strongly recommend anyone seeking an understanding of present problems to obtain and read this document. This article has only been able to provide the sketchiest summary of its contents. The task of reading right through Attempted Murder, which is set in 50 pages of A4 size, is a chore but a necessary one. The document can be obtained on the Internet, but we can supply copies if necessary at the cost of £1.50 each, which barely covers paper, printing ink and postage.

Policies are not the problem; the problem is Mr. Griffin

AS readers will know, the press hounds were sniffing around the British National Party in August hoping to help themselves to some tit bits following the news of my expulsion from the party. Unfortunately, they were given some by representatives of the BNP leadership, who were only too ready to blab their mouths off on matters that are internal to the party and should not be disclosed to the media. There were reports in *The Times* and *The Observer* which, only too predictably, supplied fuel to the theory that the divisions in the party are over policy and ideology. The *Times* report spoke of internal discontent over the 'watered-down' policies of Nick Griffin and went on to quote one 'senior source' as saying:-

"We are not a Nazi Party, but people in Burnley were being seduced by John Tyndall's rhetoric. He was leading people astray, trying to split the party, attacking the leadership..."

I would like to know who this 'senior source' is but if he/she cared to contact any

JOHN TYNDALL
pinpoints what is
dividing the BNP

Burnley BNP member who was at the meeting at which I spoke last May they could confirm that during my speech I uttered not a word about party internal divisions nor even mentioned the party leadership. As for saying that the BNP is not a Nazi Party, that is to raise a total red herring. I said nothing at the meeting to suggest the BNP *should* be a Nazi party, and I challenge anyone to produce a shred of evidence to the contrary.

The Observer spoke of a 'power struggle' in the BNP and went on to say that I was expelled "as its chairman, Nick Griffin, seeks to portray the organisation as a more mainstream body in a bid to attract new voters." Red herrings again! There is not the slightest disagreement between Mr. Griffin

and myself over the fact that the BNP should aspire to be a mainstream party and attract new voters. It was set firmly on this course from about 1990 onwards – long before Mr. Griffin came anywhere near it.

The report went on to state that "BNP modernisers said Tyndall was expelled due to his extreme views." This is nonsense, and if someone in the party made such an allegation he/she is guilty of total distortion. Nothing in the charges against me said anything about my views, only about my alleged actions. Of course, whether my views were an *underlying* reason for my expulsion is another question.

Myth

We have taken issue with Mr. Griffin over certain public relations stunts and 'gimmicks', which we believe have not gained us a single extra voter and only serve to demoralise the party internally: Sikh columnists being given space in the party newspaper; candidates endorsing black sons-in-law; talk of a few ethnic minorities in

Contd. overleaf

POLICIES ARE NOT THE PROBLEM; THE PROBLEM IS Mr. GRIFFIN

(Contd. from prev. page)

Britain being better than none at all; declarations that an all-white Britain is neither desirable nor feasible.

But, these errors apart, we are at one with everybody in the BNP over the principle that the party should present itself with an image of reasonableness, decency and civilised behaviour and should, whatever it may say on racial issues, avoid expressions of hate.

Dishonesty

This is what makes so downright dishonest Nick Griffin's article in the July issue of *Identity* magazine, which consists of a four-page tirade against me, no doubt intended to prime members to accept my kicking out of the party. I could go through this article point-by-point and refute in detail every political allegation made, but that would take excessive space and I decline to do so. I will just deal with two particularly misleading references.

At one point Mr. Griffin says:-

"The fact that our spokesmen can be guaranteed not to launch into tirades of racist abuse or turn up wearing boots and braces provides them [the media] with the reassurance they need to be able to justify... giving us a platform."

The clear implication here is that I favour BNP interviewees facing the media with boots and braces and yelling racist abuse at them. Mr. Griffin knows that this is a million miles from the truth but he chooses to let his readers think it actually reflects my ideas on political tactics. In fact, in the interview with Mark Collett on the *Dispatches* programme in November last year the BNP went far closer to projecting this image than I would have ever allowed.

In another passage Mr. Griffin refers to John Tyndall's "self-serving thesis that people are getting so desperate that they'd vote for a pig in a nazi armband if it stood for the BNP..." This is so pathetic, and reeking of desperation, that it is hardly worth dignifying with a reply. I have given ample chapter and verse in numerous articles in these columns to show that not so very far back Mr. Griffin himself was striking political postures far more extreme than anything I have endorsed for a long time – the most noteworthy example being an article in 1995 in a journal of which he was editor praising the *Waffen SS*, and more recently than that his talk of meeting left-wing opposition with "a well-aimed nationalist fist or boot."

The truth is that Nick Griffin's pose as a political leader of 'moderation' is so transparently phoney that it can quite easily be demolished by any media hack at any time

who cares to do a little research into his verbal and written utterances of the not-so-distant past; and if he wants to play the game of digging up old photographs, as he did with his July article, people might ask him about the one taken of him visiting Libya **just 14 years ago** and posing in front of a gigantic portrait of Colonel Gaddafi (reproduced with



NICK GRIFFIN

Looking only to score cheap points

the preceding article). Gaddafi, it might be worth reminding readers, helped to finance the IRA, was behind the gang responsible for the killing of WPC Yvonne Fletcher in a London street in 1984 and is generally perceived (rightly or wrongly) to have instigated the Lockerbie air disaster.

Avoiding the arguments

I allowed myself to become involved in some foolish political associations back in my late twenties (I am now 69). There is thus a four-decade gap separating me from those escapades. Like Mr. Griffin, I have made some past political mistakes; but unlike Mr. Griffin, I do not dishonestly exploit the past mistakes of others to deflect attention from current arguments. A number of us in nationalism have been guilty of indiscretions in our earlier political careers, some a long time ago, some not such a long time ago. On these matters we should present a united front, affirming that the important thing is what we propose for Britain today, not what we may have said about foreign politicians in bygone days. Least of all should any nationalist worthy of the name attempt to score cheap points over another nationalist by raking up past errors as a substitute for intelligent debate over matters of the here and now. This is to play the game of *Searchlight* and the equally obnoxious Express newspaper group.

Long ago, I came to realise that as far as Nick Griffin is concerned policy stances are

simply things to be adopted or discarded in accordance with how they further his ends in the factional wars in which, for his whole political life, he seems to have been engaged. His tactics are nothing if not consistent. He ascertains the policy stance of the person he perceives to be his current rival, and he then adopts a different one – so that he can then present his position as arising out of political necessity rather than egotism and ambition. He gets away with this with many people because he has a silver tongue that at times can be extremely persuasive. It takes getting to know the man to see through his tricks.

I have covered these matters in order to get to what is really the core of the issue; **and the core of the issue is the personality and character of Nick Griffin**; not policy arguments, not ideology, not questions of party 'imagery'.

Portent of disaster

It was after some three years of close acquaintance with Mr. Griffin that I foresaw that his assumption of the leadership of the BNP would portend disaster for the party. I have not changed that view despite some very favourable election results that the party has enjoyed since the Summer of 2001 – results that I attribute to factors far removed from Mr. Griffin's leadership and his U-turns in policy. I would incidentally say also that our earlier election victory in East London in 1993 was in no way due to anything I did myself when then leader but was entirely the result of a happy marriage between local anger against immigration and an excellent campaign by our local activists – factors which have so immensely helped us in various parts of the country over the past couple of years.

I have said this before but I will say it again: As far back as the mid-1990s I was already thinking about the desirability of finding a replacement BNP leader younger than I, and I had started to see considerable attractions in a life which, though still busy, would be free from the intense pressures that weigh on the head of the party.

But I have to say that I never saw Mr. Griffin as the right person. From the very start there was something about him that inspired doubt. On this, my wife was far more emphatic. She has met nearly all my main political associates over the years, and I have never known her to be wrong in her personal assessment of a single one of them. From the very first moment she met Griffin she warned me that I should never trust him. I conceded that she could well be right but, nevertheless, I needed some new blood in the party leadership team, particularly in the writing field, where up till then far too much fell on me. I needed someone to take over the editorship and production of *Spearhead* so that I could give my almost exclusive time and attention to party matters. I took a

gamble in taking Griffin on, while resolving to keep a careful eye on him.

It became clear to me after working with him for some time that he had joined the BNP simply and solely for his own ends. I had been warned of this from the beginning by one or two people who knew him, and it was not long before I realised that their warnings had been correct. He had a history of playing disruptive roles in virtually every organisation with which he had been involved, but at the time I was willing to put this down to the immaturity of youth. I later realised too late that he had not changed a jot.

Biting the hand that fed

Griffin did not perform the duties on *Spearhead* for nothing; I paid him, as is necessary with the work involved in a publication of our size, quality and frequency. In addition to this, he was also paid for doing certain jobs for the BNP, mainly the writing of bulletins. As proprietor of *Spearhead* and leader of the BNP, I provided Nick Griffin with his living for some three years. Right from the start, he showed his appreciation and gratitude by plotting and scheming against me. Treachery of this kind I have not known in some forty-plus years of involvement in nationalist politics, during which I have encountered some pretty despicable people.

When Griffin launched his takeover bid in 1999, I was in no way surprised. What did surprise me were the forces in the party that he had working for him. I had had some inkling of these from the effusions of *Patriot* magazine but I have to say that I totally underestimated the poison they had spread and the gullibility of so many of those on whom they had worked. Many of the latter have subsequently expressed to me their bitter regret that they were taken in by the Griffin faction, but the fact is that taken in they were at that crucial moment in the party's progress.

Our achievement pre-Griffin

And there *was* progress. The Griffin propaganda machine has skilfully manufactured a myth about the "bad old days" preceding the leadership change, but the fact is that in the two years before Mr. Griffin's takeover the BNP had increased its membership by almost 90 per cent. It put up a full slate of candidates in England and Scotland in the Euro Elections in 1999 and won TV time. Its vote over the country was steadily increasing, though it had not yet experienced the dramatic increase that later led to several councillors being elected. This big upsurge began in certain northern towns in the general election of June 2001, and the catalyst that caused it was undoubtedly the race riot in Oldham just three weeks previously. This gave the party a new credibility rating that led to council seats being won the

following year and again in 2003. The fact is, however, that between the leadership change in September 1999 and June 2001 (nearly two years) there was no significant rise in BNP votes that marked anything new from what had already been occurring for some time. When Nick Griffin himself stood as the party's candidate in West Bromwich West in November 2000 he obtained a very mediocre 794 votes (4.2 per cent) in an area which had always been very fertile nationalist territory. This was a mere 13 votes more than a previous BNP candidate, Steve Edwards, had achieved **in just one ward** in the same constituency a few months earlier!

Fiasco in West Midlands

Mention of Steve Edwards brings us to the story of how Nick Griffin virtually wrecked the BNP in the West Midlands as a result of his paranoid witch hunt against Steve and his wife Sharron in the late Summer of 2000. Steve and Sharron, among others, had raised some awkward questions about Nick's management of party finances. The next thing was that, like many before and after them, they found themselves expelled by Griffin from the party. Sharron Edwards had in fact been the region's chosen candidate for West Bromwich West, but Griffin deselected her at the same time as expelling her. He was later forced to reinstate the Edwards as members following an angry protest meeting in the area in support of them, but Sharron was not reinstated as the West Bromwich candidate. The result? Disgusted local activists who had been prepared to campaign for her, and had in fact already started to do so, refused to campaign for Griffin. The latter was forced to import campaign helpers from other areas to make any kind of showing at all, but it was not enough. The opportunity for an excellent vote was thrown away.

The Edwards and a large portion of the then BNP West Midlands membership then left the party and took part in the formation of the breakaway Freedom Party, on behalf of which Sharron Edwards is now a councillor. I believed this to be a big mistake and advised Steve and Sharron against it. However, their anger against their treatment by Griffin was such that I failed to persuade them to stay in the BNP. Prior to their departure, the BNP in the West Midlands was experiencing a tremendous boom similar to that which it later enjoyed in the North West of England, and had Griffin not wrecked everything it could today be as strong as the North West. It has made a partial recovery but is still very far from what it was prior to the Summer of 2000.

Steve and Sharron Edwards had previously supported Griffin's candidature in the BNP leadership ballot in 1999, and their names and photos were prominently featured in this capacity in some of the Griffin cam-

paign literature. They were to become badly disillusioned. In a letter to me in December 2000 they said:-

"The current leader Nick Griffin is a and a (words deleted to avoid possible libel action)... Decent people have been badly let down... Griffin has wrecked and factionalised every movement he has been associated with... If Griffin is replaced, we may be able to join forces again."

The reference to wrecking and factionalising is significant. Griffin is in fact well on the way to doing this to the BNP as a whole, whereas prior to his entry it enjoyed 14 years of almost total harmony. Before that, he accomplished much the same thing with the National Front, and this is why we have given considerable space to the story of the NF breakup in 1986 earlier in this issue. But Nick does not seem content with this record. He seems to want to extend it. The latest area of his wrecking operations is the very one where the BNP has been doing best of all in the last couple of years: Lancashire and the North West.

Vendetta against Burnley BNP

The full story of the damage Griffin has been doing in this region is much too long and detailed to fit into this article; others are working on that and before long we may have the chance to study it. Here I will just give a few of the barest of bare bones.

Somehow Nick has managed to alienate a large portion of leading activists in the most successful branch of all, the Burnley branch. Local people are better qualified than I am to give chapter and verse as to how this has happened. My own vantage point is a limited one and connected with my own personal experience. I was invited to speak at a Burnley branch meeting on the 1st August 2002. This infuriated Griffin when he heard about it and he employed all the persuasion he could to get the then organiser, Steve Smith, to cancel the invitation. Steve, to his great credit, stood firm. From then on, it became clear that his card was marked.

Spearhead gave a full account of that event in its September 2002 issue and I will not repeat all the details here save to say that, mysteriously, Anti-Nazi League demonstrators turned up on the evening, whereas they had not been present at any previous Burnley BNP meeting nor have been since. Who tipped them off about the meeting and my appearance at it as speaker? You can make up your own mind!

The meeting, notwithstanding all this, was very successful – but not nearly as successful as the one which took place on May 29th of this year, when 140 people turned up to hear speeches by Richard Edmonds and myself. This further angered Griffin. An inside report I received from friends in the party told me that at a private

Contd. overleaf

POLICIES ARE NOT THE PROBLEM; THE PROBLEM IS Mr. GRIFFIN

(Contd. from prev. page)

meeting at Blackburn just previous to the Burnley one Griffin had hatched a scheme to disrupt the latter. The plan was that one of his (Griffin's) acolytes would be present at the Burnley meeting accompanied by a group of 'heavies'. At a certain point in my speech the acolyte would stage a protest, whereupon if anyone tried to restrain him the heavies would move in and a violent scene would ensue. Then Griffin would be able to claim that wherever Tyndall speaks at BNP meetings there is disorder.

The plan went badly wrong. As the meeting proceeded, the Griffin acolyte could see that his brawny companions were reacting so enthusiastically to Richard Edmonds' and my speeches that he would be unlikely to get their support if he tried to make trouble. He remained silent and nothing happened. The meeting went smoothly and was a terrific success.

Apparently, *Searchlight* got hold of the story and printed it, but in this case the fact does not make the story untrue. My own source for it is much more reliable.

I have spoken at other meetings in the North West over recent months, in all of them getting a very good reception, and was down to speak at more when Griffin contrived my expulsion. It is very clear that he was getting frightened that I might influence local members

Dissatisfaction

The upshot of all this – combined with other factors with which I am not connected – is that there is now widespread dissatisfaction with the party leadership in this the BNP's strongest and most successful region. Nick Griffin seems to have alienated, one by one, a large portion of the local leaders and leading activists in the region, and the latest is that Steve Smith, the initial architect of the party's tremendous success in Burnley (others have played important parts more lately), has been driven out of his position in the branch. Actually he chose to leave of his own accord, but it was his treatment by Griffin that led to this.

I have had to spend a great deal of time on the telephone in the past few months endeavouring to bolster the morale of people in the North West of England and persuade them that on no account should they quit the party.

I believe that if Nick Griffin is allowed to continue his jealous and vindictive rampage he will wreck the Lancashire and North West BNP just as he did the West Midlands three years ago and the National Front many years before that.

It gives me no satisfaction to say that the



THE YOUNGER GRIFFIN

This photo was taken circa 1981-82, possibly at the time its subject was an NF by-election candidate. His former colleague Martin Webster alleges a homosexual relationship between the two a short while earlier. This may be a malicious old queen's tale, but were this so Nick would have done better to have sued for libel.

warnings I gave about Nick Griffin back in 1999, ignored as they then were by many, have been overwhelmingly vindicated.

As readers will know from the opening words of this article and from last month's report, I am currently a non-member of the BNP, having joined the long list of people who have been expelled from nationalist parties by the machinations of Nick Griffin. I am planning to take legal action over this but for the moment am barred from BNP meetings, along with several others.

One of the counts on which Griffin's disciplinary tribunal expelled me was that I had 'slandered' him personally (libel is the correct term but we will not split hairs). Nick alleges that I have made defamatory remarks about him.

The 'gay' story

Well, it is interesting to learn that Nick Griffin these days considers defamation of himself a cause for action against the defamer, for this did not seem to be his attitude back in 1999, when a former high-ranking National Front official, Martin Webster, put out a circular alleging a homosexual relationship between himself and Griffin back in the late 1970s. Webster, in doing this, challenged Griffin to take him to court for libel if the allegation was untrue. Griffin declined to do so, arguing that as Webster was a 'man of straw' he would not

get any damages off him. This completely sidetracked the main issue, which was not one of money but of the personal honour and reputation of the leader of the BNP, and thus of the BNP itself.

But it was not only Webster whom Griffin could have sued. The story was covered in both *The Sunday Times* and *Searchlight* magazine, in the latter case being written in tones which gave credence to Webster's claims. Neither of these publications are exactly without assets, and Griffin could have got tidy sums off them had he taken them to court and won.

But he chose not to – which makes it strange that he is now so sensitive to imagined 'defamation' by me and has had me hounded out of the BNP for my troubles.

As to whether Webster's story of a homosexual affair with Griffin was true or not, I simply don't know.

But what I do know is that if it was not true Griffin should have sought satisfaction in a court of law. He did not, and it is now well past the time limit for him to do so. If the story is again raised either by Webster or anyone else, it will be his duty to take immediate legal action to squash it – because the good name of the BNP is at stake, not just his own.

It will be gleaned from what I have said in this article that I believe that the removal of Nick Griffin from control of the BNP is essential to the party's long-term health and national credibility – and, in the shorter term, to its internal harmony and unity. The man is a wrecker, wherever he goes and whatever he gets into. Throughout his political career he has left a long trail of disillusioned one-time supporters and betrayed and disgusted one-time friends.

The takeover tendency

Griffin's takeover of the BNP might be likened to the familiar practices of certain people in the world of business. First, an enterprise is founded and built up by the vision, dedication, hard work and sacrifice of a number of pioneers, who have faith in the idea behind it and slave away with perseverance to make it a going concern. Then, once it becomes just that, a going concern, the big business sharks move in and through unscrupulous boardroom politics take it away from its founders to exploit it for themselves. We know who are the people most adept at this kind of operation.

When the BNP was founded in 1982, Nick Griffin was one of those on the sidelines, sneering at and deprecating our efforts in the columns of the publications with which he was then involved – all publications, incidentally, which folded up a long time ago and have not been seen since (these people can never sustain anything for long).

But when in the early 1990s the BNP started to move ahead and show some excellent results in elections it was then that

our Nick changed his attitude towards us. He began to become friendly, and he built some fraternal contacts with our Croydon branch. It was not very long after we won our first council seat in Millwall in September 1993 that he started to write to me. One thing led to another and, bit by bit, Nick got his feet under the table of the BNP – something for which I must bear the main share of the responsibility, notwithstanding the mitigating circumstances I have explained earlier in this article.

Talent wasted

Now in a position of control, Griffin is directing the party on a basis of favouritism towards his friends and vicious hatred towards those of talent and ability who are prepared to stand up to him. The result is that the BNP is only employing a part of its real human resources: promotions are made of those prepared to be subservient – or, if people of genuine merit do get promoted inadvertently, they will be doomed to have their rise in the party curbed the moment they give the slightest hint that they are unprepared to accept lackey status. I have numerous witnesses to this.

There are still some fine and very able people in the senior circles of the BNP, notwithstanding all this. But they are aware of the need for them not to show dissent if they are to continue occupying responsible positions and giving the party the full benefit of

their abilities. For the most well-meaning of reasons, their dissatisfaction is muted. Were it not, Griffin would have a whole lot more problems of personnel than he already has, and he has problems enough.

And indeed we would be witnessing yet more expulsions!

But alongside these excellent servants of the BNP there are also, inevitably, a number of pure toadies of the kind that get close to the top of any political party, not by performance but by flattery and yes-manship. I have come to see a number of them through close acquaintance over the years – people who, when I was seen to be 'on top', were eager to declare their loyalty to me but underwent an indecently rapid change of allegiance once this situation no longer applied. They are of the type who, if Griffin were defeated and down tomorrow, would be pushing to the front of the queue to kick him.

Last, but not least in importance, there are a few who have their own particular agendas. I suspect that these people mostly harbour the same personal contempt for Mr. Griffin as I have, but find him a useful tool in their designs.

Riding on a roll

At the moment the one thing going for Nick is the fact that the BNP is, electionwise, on a roll – with the Thurrock win just the latest case in point. As long as there is the widespread *perception* in the party, however

mistaken it is, that he and his policy somersaults have some connection with this, he will survive for a while, and any premature bid to unseat him in an election would be a charge of the Light Brigade. Not only do I and my allies know this, but he also knows it. Hence his insufferable arrogance and *hubris* and his belief that he can carry on conducting purges against anyone who crosses him – and get away with it.

For four years, while being critical of some of Nick Griffin's policy decisions, I have held back from giving him the full treatment in terms of personal assessment. In view of recent events, I no longer feel constrained to do so. Hence this article and the one preceding it.

At my stage of life, I do not care overmuch whether I ever again become BNP leader or not. I never was obsessed with this position as Nick Griffin very clearly is. If future events should take a turn that led to a demand for me to come back, I would be available as a matter of duty. However, from my point of view the much preferred solution is that a younger man emerge from out of the many talented people we are now recruiting and show the ability and willing to take over the reins and lead the party forth into the future. If such a person does appear he will have no firmer supporter than me.

But first things first. Before anything permanent can be done, we have to get rid of the wrecker-in-chief.

Action for reinstatement of John Tyndall

LEGAL FUND

Last month, at the end of a report on the expulsion of *Spearhead* editor John Tyndall from the British National Party, it was stated that Mr. Tyndall would be taking legal action to secure reinstatement, and that we would be launching a fund to help meet the costs involved.

Mr. Tyndall has in fact placed the case in the hands of a London solicitor, and just before our going to press with this issue he received a letter from the solicitor giving a favourable opinion on his prospects of success in the action.

It has, however, been necessary to supply our solicitors with an 'up-front' payment in order to get the case on the move, and further costs of this kind will be incurred in due course.

Mr. Tyndall does have access to a special fund arising from a legacy from a deceased supporter, which has been placed at his disposal for political use to be decided at his own discretion. However, we wish to dip into this fund to the very minimum extent necessary. We are therefore launching what will be known as the '*Spearhead* Legal Fund' with a view to raising the money to cover most, if not all, of the costs incurred in this action. Should Mr. Tyndall win the case and be awarded his full costs, the money will of course be recovered. In that event we will confer with the main contributors concerning its disposal.

A supporter in Lancashire has kick-started the fund with a donation of £50.00, for which we are most grateful. Further donations should be made out to our publishers, Albion Press, and sent to our usual address at: PO Box 2471, Hove, East Sussex BN3 4DT.

WHO GOES THERE?

THE latest diversionary tactic by the Home Office in relation to the continuing massive invasion of Britain by unwanted immigrants is a 'Citizenship' test.

Said to be no more rigorous than the driving test questionnaire, and subject to waivers in some cases, the test is supposed to provide a better assurance of the immigrants being assimilated into British society. But the 'alien wedge' – to adopt Enoch Powell's perceptive term – does not become less of a menace to social cohesion by virtue of officialdom's stamp of approval. **The only valid test of British citizenship is acceptance by the indigenous people of this country.** Without that, no amount of integrationist claptrap and official gobbledegook will make an obvious alien a legitimate one of us.

If you are of English, Irish, Welsh or Scottish ancestry as far back as you can trace, then you will never persuade anyone that you have become, for example, Chinese or Nigerian or Pakistani overnight. As we are for ever advised in all other contexts, if it looks like a duck, walks like a duck and quacks like a duck, then it's undoubtedly a duck. Ask the Israelis if a Palestinian could ever be regarded as an Israeli citizen, and vice versa. Ask the Pakistanis if Hindus could ever be regarded as compatriots. Nearer home, ask the people of Ulster if Irish Republicans could ever become loyal British subjects. On the evidence of the replies, try persuading us that something roughly equivalent to the driving-test questionnaire can transmute obvious aliens into integral elements of the British Nation.

However fluently the alien asserts his claim to citizenship, and however many documents he brandishes to support this claim, alien he will ever remain in the eyes, hearts and minds of the native British. Condemning this as 'institutional racism' is like condemning gravity for geophysical fascism when you fall off a ladder.

One is bound to recall the Hans Anderson fable about a miserable swan failing to find acceptance among ducks, and how happiness came only when it found itself among other swans. No doubt the politically correct version of this fable would have a bureaucrat hanging a label round the alien bird's neck saying: "This is officially a duck."

MINDSET ON RACE

The prevailing liberal-socialist mindset on racial issues is as radically mistaken as Vatican authorities were for centuries regarding the facts of astronomy. As Galileo and others learned to their cost, challenging the official version provoked persecution for heresy and diabolical intentions. Under the present multi-racialist regime, anyone asserting the facts of anthropology is similarly vilified. This institutional totalitarianism has become as malignant and all-pervasive as anything envisaged in the dystopias of writers like George Orwell and Aldous Huxley. But whereas the facts of

FRANK KIMBAL JOHNSON looks at the Government's proposed 'Britishness' test

astronomy could be concealed by a dogmatic régime for centuries, the fallacies of multi-racialism are daily apparent to most of the population. It is this glaring disparity between government *diktat* and common experience, not 'institutional racism', which generates political apathy and cynicism.

The advancement of science undermined Papal infallibility; similarly, everyday experience fatally damages the present Government's credibility on those issues of most importance to the nation's future.

At the root of all social engineering and egalitarian politics is a deeply sinister dogma: that identity is a matter of official decree, taking precedence over all the facts of nature, evolution, history and human characteristics. The individual becomes no more than a bureaucratic cipher, a sociological category, an arbitrary definition. Deprived of official approval, he or she becomes a 'non-person' at best and a criminal at worst. On closer examination, therefore, what passes for liberal philanthropy turns out to be profoundly misanthropic, with as much claim to 'humanity' as the medieval Vatican had to scientific integrity.

FORTIFYING DOGMA

The resort to multi-racialist legislation is the most striking example in modern politics of a government trying to fortify an utterly discredited dogma with penal sanctions. Having failed in a government's first duty of protecting the realm against invaders, our Government now seeks to escape the charge by re-defining those invaders as 'asylum-seekers' and 'socio-economic assets'. Such a government would have defined the Moorish invaders of Europe as missionaries and the Vikings as Scandinavian tourists.

Somehow or other, we have to keep the flame of truth alight in this darkening world of political correctness, censorship and mass-media indoctrination. That robust grounding in common sense and pragmatism which made Britain the pioneer of industrial and civic development is still there. It still calls a spade a spade and anyone manifestly non-British a foreigner. On this rock of ages the dogmas of liberalism and socialism will finally dash themselves to pieces.

All of this will of course be denounced as rabid 'racism' by people whose only claim to political wisdom is the public assertion of *multi-racialism*. It never seems to occur to such people that defence of one's race and nation is second only to protection of one's family in the duty of every genuine citizen. In their warped perspective, all defensive

battles against actual and would-be invaders of this country can be reduced to 'xenophobia'.

Likewise, they are likely to regard defending your property against burglars as capitalist violence against the underprivileged. Amazing though it seems to such mindless bigots, it is entirely possible for us to find people of other races quite charming and indeed admirable without wishing to have them as permanent occupiers of our homeland. Guests are one thing, squatters quite another. No doubt, the next directive to our defence forces will be to abolish the sentry's "Who goes there?" in favour of "Have you got a Home Office permit?" Meanwhile, who needs an identity card when we can recognise our own kind from the opposite side of the street?



MORE ASYLUM-SEEKERS

The Government imagines they can become 'British' just by answering a few questions

VOCABULARY FOR THE POLITICALLY AWARE

Semantic Forgery

A tool of the 'political-correctness' campaign, whereby the actual meaning of familiar words is, as it were, overwritten with a tendentious new meaning.

Typical examples are 'gay' for sex pervert; 'multi-cultural' for mongrelised and 'fascist' for patriot (see 'Propaganda').

Sexism

A smear-word used by those who blame the male sex for all or most of society's problems. It is a form of the RPI Syndrome (qv), popular with women who are sexually unattractive, unsuccessful, embittered or all three. Perversely, feminists revile men as 'sexist' when they behave in a chivalrous, considerate and deferential way towards women. Feminism is psychological homosexuality; a form of paranoia.

Social Engineering

Using legislation, the mass media, institutional power and propaganda to enforce conformity with the liberal consensus(qv).

Society

- Applies to any large group which is:-
- Racially and culturally homogeneous.
 - Compounded of sub-groups with different and mutually-supportive roles.
 - Self-governing over many generations
 - Coherent within a well-established system of law and government.

(Thus a population only becomes a society where these conditions apply).

Sociology

A pseudo-science mostly consisting of tendentious argument, dubious statistics, pretentious jargon and fictitious anecdotes. Always an academic soft option, it pontificates on everything from religion to pop music, race-riots, politics, shopping, football, crime, sex, business and anything else that commonly involves at least two people. It regards the European male as the arch-villain of history and embraces the liberal consensus in its entirety. It is dogmatically egalitarian in its approach to all social and political issues, and will always seek to disparage and discredit the outstanding individual. If people were indeed equal, they would

be as predictable as rabbits and just about as interesting. All human progress arises from the *differences* between races, sexes and the efforts of exceptional individuals.

Stereotyping

Tendency of the Establishment and its dupes to depict all patriots as 'neo-nazi' thugs with shaven heads, tattoos and boots for kicking with. The term is commonly applied to most people's inability to envisage negroes in roles they have never actually fulfilled in all their history. So it bears repeating that we didn't stereotype the negro; Nature did.

Subsidiarity

Euphemism for the (minor) residual powers which a federal Europe would be prepared to allow to former nation-states. As a word, it has the special merit among Eurocrats of being very obscure, thus leaving the ordinary citizen in the dark as to the real state of affairs intended. The mind boggles at a national anthem to 'subsidiarity'.

Subversion

Refers to any activity designed to undermine the power, influence, prosperity and even existence of a nation-state.

Tokenism

Employing enough Blacks and Asians to avoid persecution by the Race Relations Industry and to appease the commissars of political correctness. 'Token Blacks' are therefore prominent in the mass-media, advertisements and renegade organisations generally. Note that, for all the liberal espousal of 'proportional representation', aliens are invariably grossly *over-represented* in the foregoing and other institutions where liberalism is dominant.

Vision

In the political and historical context, this means the ability to see beyond mere expediency and self-interest. It is what distinguishes the statesman from the mere politician, the leader from the self-serving opportunist.

'Wimp'

Slang term of derision for a woolly-minded and morally feeble liberal, who cloaks his/her cowardice in philanthropic pretensions.

Xenophilia

Inordinate esteem for an alien person or culture. Typified in the fatuous middle-class 'disciples' of oriental religious shysters and the indiscriminate applause given to any negro performance in sports, entertainment or whatever. It is a form of masochism (qv), the pervert deriving a warped satisfaction from deserting his/her own native culture and seeing this as a kind of revenge for not being sufficiently esteemed by his/her own society.

Xenophobia

Unreasonable fear of aliens or unfamiliar cultures. Not to be confused with natural antipathy towards alien invaders of the homeland, which is of course eminently reasonable. In opposing the Afro-Asian invasion of Britain, genuine patriots are no more 'xenophobic' than were Battle of Britain pilots, Drake's seamen or the warriors of King Alfred.

Zionist

One who regards the Jewish race as God's 'chosen people', destined to prevail above all other racial and religious groups. He/she is always primarily the servant of Jewish interests whatever his/her role in the host society, but will naturally conceal this order of priorities as a matter of expediency.

ZOG

Acronym for 'Zionist Occupation Government', which can be held to exist wherever Jews occupy senior positions in a political establishment in large numbers and wield considerable power (which is always wielded first and foremost in Jewish interests). For example, Jews comprise about 2.5 per cent of the US population; yet they occupy 26 per cent of mass-media posts; they comprise 59 per cent of key personnel in the Hollywood film industry, 40 per cent of leading New York and Washington law firms, 23 per cent of the wealthiest citizens, and between 30 to 40 per cent of 'Ivy League' students. Added to this, both of the Supreme Court judges appointed by President Clinton were Jewish.

In the UK, Jews are also grossly over-represented in the upper echelons of government, in Parliament, in the law courts, in academia, publishing and the mass-media (British TV is dominated by five Jews).

Blair and Bush:

AGENTS OF DESTRUCTION AND CHAOS

IAN BUCKLEY offers an appraisal of the self-proclaimed champions of 'peace, humanity and democracy'



THE OPPOSITION MEDIA often equate nationalism with war, violence or brutality. "Skinheads who like a touch of aggro" is the usual designation. But I think, in order to evaluate this claim, we should first take a brief look at the handiwork of the globalists and liberals.

The American-based mass media glamourised the first armoured push into Baghdad as the 'Thunder Run'. The consequences were reported by Ed Vulliamy:-

"They were firing at anything that moved for three days. I myself helped get 30 bodies into the supermarket – what a smell they made! Across from Majul's now re-opened stall are two bus shelters, on either side of the road, now riddled with heavy-calibre fire. Majul saw what happened: "There was a military car, and the soldiers ran into that far shelter. The Americans shot that one up. But then a bus came down the road, and the people ran off it to hide in the other bus shelter – and they fired at that one, too. I could hear people screaming as they died, even with the noise of the guns."

Besides being a vivid demonstration in blood and fire of what the limitless malice and ambition of the 'neo-con' segment of Washington really means, such horrific events are an utter contrast with the benign nationalist concept of armed neutrality.

UNWINNABLE WAR

Since then, both American and British forces have become involved in an unwinnable guerrilla war, sustaining fairly heavy casualties, the full extent of which may be concealed from us. In addition, huge bombs have devastated the UN headquarters in Baghdad and a Muslim shrine in Nahaf. Regarding the latter attack, perhaps one should ask just who benefits – *cui bono?* – from setting Muslim factions at each other's throats.

Maybe it has no bearing on present-day events, but in the early 1950s the Israeli *Palmach* organisation set off three bombs in Iraq, aimed at terrorising the Jewish community into leaving for Israel. These were initially blamed on – yes, you've guessed it – "extremist Arab nationalists."

Blair was warned beforehand of all the likely consequences of attacking Iraq, but choose instead to witter on about 'Weapons of Mass Destruction' which never existed outside the confines of his

own peculiar mind, just as he now, a little later, rants endlessly about 'terrorism'.

But in the context of Iraq and the Middle East, most of what is termed 'terrorism' is in fact *counter-terrorism*. But there is one extra salient fact that's always ignored in all the idle chatter from the media about terrorism. Perhaps few commentators are even aware of the matter, but the terrorism which has bedevilled the Western World for half a century has an unusual specific origin.

For, in accordance with Churchill's instructions to the Special Operations Executive (SOE) to "set Europe ablaze," most of the organisational methods, techniques and technology now used by terrorist groups were pioneered by Britain in the 1940s. So, we can see that, in addition to their more obvious Israel-first attitudes, Bush and Blair are well and truly hoist with their own petard!

But to counter the problem that their own governments have created, the ordinary citizens of Britain and America must put up with more and more erosion of civil liberties, all under the false guise of 'fighting terrorism'. In Britain, serious suggestions have been mooted that all children should be issued with computerised IDs, and that DNA material should be taken in order to establish a complete database.

An American friend recently commented to me that in her opinion the 'Israelisation' of the United States was well under way. The FBI now takes an interest even in what library books are taken out by readers, as well as the e-mails of those Americans who are unconvinced of the need to spend \$87 billion or more on futile and bloody military involvement. That amount is, by the way, on top of the \$78 billion already spent on the war against Iraq. Meanwhile, the US itself increasingly descends into the twilight world of economic stagnation, rampant crime and decaying infrastructure, a fate our own country shares.

WHERE THE REAL POWER LIES

As the 'leader' responsible for chaos and oppression on a grand scale, George W. Bush is pretty unconvincing – on first impressions no more than a semi-catatonic figure with an ape-like gait. Surely the real power now inheres in the likes of Richard Perle, rumoured by some to be Mossad's agent-in-chief in the United States – and beyond him with the media lords and heads of the armament corporations.

In our own country, is it too fanciful to imagine that the money given by Levy & Co. has transmuted into the spilled blood of British soldiers in Iraq? Perhaps. New Labour has accumulated a great deal of cash from its new associations, but wasn't it Balzac who said that behind every great fortune was a crime?

In any case, our warnings have surely come to pass. I ask you, who really are the dangerous nutters "up for a bit of aggro?" *Au contraire*, if any criticism could be levelled at nationalists it must be surely be that we have not been aggressive enough in refuting the tide of lies directed against us. Let us instead oppose this monstrous government by any legal means at our disposal. As a first step, the journey of a thousand miles begins with one: buying cigarettes, alcohol or lottery tickets deprives them of revenue that could be used for unworthy causes at home or abroad.

Beyond that is a whole field of non-violent civil disobedience. I for one would not disparage Gandhi or Mandela, but rather seek to learn from them what we can take and use in a last defence of our people and our heritage. Likewise, the power of the boycott has been well demonstrated, and all that prevents us from using such a weapon is a lack of cohesion. But all of this is along the lines of thinking aloud – while thinking is still permitted – of what we might have to face as the government becomes more and more frightened of its disillusioned people.

MANIPULATING THE SYSTEM

None of us likes the money-worshipping system that has eclipsed the worthy traditional values of honour and loyalty, but we must learn to fight from within, to manipulate that system to our own advantage. When faced with duplicity and lies on a massive scale – as demonstrated by 'our betters' in Westminster day in and day out – any trace of nobility or honour seems at times to be akin to fighting blindfold with one hand tied behind your back. But truth will out in the end.

One pleasing recent item of news was the crescendo of prolonged jeering and booing which greeted Blair's arrival at the Braemar Highland Games, causing his premature departure from



DESTRUCTION AND DEATH

This was the scene after the huge bomb explosion at the Shi'ite shrine at Najaf, south of Baghdad, on the 31st August. The bomb was part of a strategy of destabilising the country to render the Anglo-American occupation unworkable. Blair and Bush are causing far more misery in the country than they could ever have saved.

that event. Such actions would have been previously unthinkable at such a socially conservative event. One eye-witness said: "The booing was coming from all around. I did not get the impression it was just a handful of people. It was a real groundswell of opinion."

Listen to that groundswell, Mr Blair. It is telling you and your masters that we have had enough of you. The Iraqi 'war' – which was never a real war but instead a successful attempt to destroy and neutralise that nation *vis-à-vis* Israel – has opened our eyes at last. It is all worthwhile if it leads to the downfall of the New World Order.

MADHOUSE BRITAIN

READING JAIL, the place where Oscar Wilde wrote his famous ballad, is to be known by that name no longer. The prison's governor, Mr. Nick Leader, has announced that henceforth his establishment will be known as a 'learning centre'.

A Home Office spokesman stressed that the place was "keen to further develop and promote its work to rehabilitate offenders through the teaching of basic skills."

* * *

A **RACE ACTIVIST** who works for the Crown Prosecution Service is to leave her job with a £250,000 pay-off after claiming to have been the victim of 'discrimination'.

In return for this settlement, Indian-born barrister Maria Bamieh has agreed to drop a series of tribunal claims.

A report in the Daily Mail (6.9.03) admitted that the case was the result of the Director of Public Prosecutions Sir David Calvert-Smith acknowledging that the CPS was 'institutionally racist'. The report said: "His policy of admitting racism in his organisation has helped generate numerous claims against the CPS."

* * *

COUNCIL WORKERS were sent to repair a broken window at the home of a disabled woman

in the West Midlands. They replaced every window in the house – except the one that was broken.

* * *

A **NEW CENTRE** for asylum-seekers earmarked for Piddington, in Oxfordshire, has enormously angered local residents but Deputy Premier John Prescott is riding roughshod over their wishes. The centre will be built, whether they like it or not.

But that's not all. It's going to be a real five-star place. Set in lush grounds, it will have state-of-the art housing and facilities, including a crèche, library, information technology and e-mail connection – plus a minibus for jaunts into nearby towns. Also there will be a sports centre, swimming pool and football pitch, plus a medical centre, rooms for worship, possibly including a mosque, and sophisticated education facilities for adults and their children.

The bill to the taxpayer is not yet known.

* * *

KNOWN DRUG ADDICTS are to be offered short cuts to university degrees on the basis of the 'valuable life experience' they have gained.

This deal is being offered as part of a higher education scheme called the 'Accreditation of

Prior Experiential Learning, which allows universities to waive up to two thirds of courses if students can show that their previous experience overlaps with material covered in lessons.

* * *

MARTIN WOODGATE, a Bradford businessman, found that one of his delivery vans had been stolen. Then he remembered that one of the items in the van was the driver's mobile phone. He rang the number and the thief, obviously not a candidate for Brain of Britain, answered and agreed to meet Mr. Woodgate and return the vehicle to him for a payment of £500.

Mr. Woodgate then contacted the police so that they could be there at the rendezvous to make an arrest. To his amazement, they refused, just offering him a crime reference number.

* * *

LONDON'S Evening Standard, reporting on this year's Notting Hill Carnival, said: "The event passed off relatively peacefully. Two people were stabbed and dozens slightly injured. The report went on to say that there had been 175 arrests but, according to police, the day had been "largely trouble-free."

* * *

STRATHCLYDE HOSPITAL is advertising for a 'Condom Distributions Schemes Co-ordinator', saying that the job provides "an exciting opportunity to promote the further development of innovative condom distribution schemes..."

ANTONY MILNE offers some observations on the Hutton Enquiry

BRITISH INTELLIGENCE IN TATTERS

THE HUTTON ENQUIRY has revealed that the reputation of Britain's intelligence services is now in tatters. The merest suspicion that an intelligence agency has succumbed to political or media pressures greatly undermines its credibility.

One of the culprits revealed in the enquiry was John Scarlett, no less a figure than head of the Joint Intelligence Committee (JIC), who oversees the heads of all the other intelligence agencies, including the Defence Intelligence Staff. In earlier testimony, he said that the intelligence dossier on Iraq's supposed chemical and biological weapons programme had not been exaggerated by Blair and his cronies in order to strengthen the case for going to war against Iraq. But later, weapons scientists like Dr. Brian Jones, who headed a Ministry of Defence section concerned with nuclear, biological and chemical weapons (WMD), repudiated Scarlett's view that the Government's dossier had not been 'over-egged'. He said that he and Dr. David Kelly, at the centre of the enquiry, thought the dossier did not accurately reflect Iraq's weapons capabilities.

HOKUM

Let us get to the nub of the matter. The link between Saddam Hussein and the September 11 attacks, and the suspicion that Iraq was supplying unconventional weapons to Islamic terrorists, was a load of hokum. In fact, the source of the intelligence about Iraq's WMD came from Iraqi expatriates who had their own axes to grind against Saddam, rather than the western intelligence agencies.

There was widespread public opposition to the war with Iraq throughout the world, a war which was regarded as illegitimate. Now both the Americans and ourselves have landed up in a *predictable* quagmire, almost under siege behind barbed wire, trying to rebuild a country that they and we smashed up in the first place for no obvious reason, and being shot at and bombed in the process.


Everyone with an understanding of

military matters agreed that it would be easy for the Yanks and the Brits to beat Saddam's forces on the battlefield, but also that it would be very hard to run the country afterwards. Now the Government is having to send yet more thousands of troops to Iraq at a time when the British

Army is already stretched to the limit. This is costing the taxpayer £5 million a day. For the Americans, it is costing a billion dollars a week.

Now, after the 'war', the reliability of British intelligence is called into question because no weapons of mass destruction have been found – and of course were never going to be found. Intelligence material was definitely misused by Blair and his spin doctors, since he and George Bush wanted to put the frighteners on the public. Blair's personal Politburo also took the decision to go to war without public or UN approval, and without consultation with senior secretaries of state for foreign affairs and defence, who just acted as yes-men.

But there is another point to be made. The arrogant twerps in the treacherously unpatriotic media talk about one



SCARLETT

A 'Blair crony', he tried to back up his boss's lies about Iraq's weapons



THE MI6 HEADQUARTERS IN LONDON
Made a sitting target for attack

BBC man's off-the-cuff remarks made over the airwaves, while they themselves give the low-down in print of the inner workings of the intelligence community, what e-mails they send to each other, who said what to whom and why, who passed the buck onto whom, and so on. The e-mails sent on Dr. David Kelly's own computer were published openly in the press, and he was one of the top chemical weapons experts attached to the UN inspection team, and naturally had close contacts with the intelligence services.

INTELLIGENCE SUBVERTED

Many people used to think that intelligence and security matters were state secrets. Just 20 years ago, MI5 and MI6 were not even supposed to exist. Certainly, few knew of the whereabouts of the buildings in which they were located. Now everyone knows, and it was not surprising that the MI6 HQ on London's South Bank near Vauxhall Bridge was attacked with missiles a few years ago.

British intelligence has been subverted ever since the time that, under the Major régime, naive politicians, in the name of 'open government', revealed the identities of virtually all the top intelligence officials: the heads of MI5, MI6, the JIC, the chief and deputy chief of defence intelligence, and many others. Photos of most of these people have been published in the press, and in a foolish magazine called *Eye Spy*.

Indeed, so much has been released that our enemies could soon have inside

knowledge of the entire intelligence and threat-assessment procedure, which includes the workings of the Civil Contingencies Secretariat, as well as the goings-on at Dr. Brian Jones' Defence Intelligence Section (DIS).

Things have gone seriously wrong with British intelligence because our politicians allowed all this to happen. MI5 is not supposed to be like the KGB, just saying what they are told to say by the big chief at the top. They could have told the politicians and the press: "Either you want a secret intelligence régime or you don't. And if you do, sod off."

POOR QUALITY PERSONNEL

One other problem is the poor quality of recruits to the intelligence services. Misfits, alcoholics and weirdos have not been thoroughly screened. The post-war list of traitors is as long as your arm.

Poor promotion to the top is also to blame. How did Stella Rimington ever get to be head of MI5, and then be allowed to publish her memoirs after having been warned not to do so – and after MI5 had tried to prosecute others like David Shayler and Richard Tomlinson, who also wrote about the inner workings of the agency?

Even Dr. David Kelly's behaviour was a bit odd. The weapons expert at the centre of the storm was apparently warned by the MoD about giving too many briefings to journalists. When the Government's Foreign Affairs Committee said they wanted him to appear in a live TV session, this apparently made him extremely stressed up and depressed. He should in that case have refused to co-operate with the TV people, citing the MoD warnings, or resigned in principle after the event, rather than kill himself.

It is even odder that the warmongering Tony Blair should, without hesitation, have decided to hold a public enquiry into the affair so that his Politburo approach to the whole messy Iraq business would get the full media treatment. He certainly hasn't done himself or this country any favours. The proper legal procedure would be to have a coroner's inquest, and the Lord Chancellor should have stepped in to stop Hutton's media peep show. But he (the Lord Chancellor) was another Blair crony.

The operational side of terrorism containment is in crisis too. A Special Branch officer was stabbed to death by an illegal immigrant in a well publicised incident. There are tens of thousands of Islamic radicals in Britain who cannot be deported. Now we learn that the entire anti-racial-profiling, human-rights, open-

door policies in Britain and Europe are breeding dangerous disgruntlement because so much of British intelligence work is wasted, as there are simply too many illegals to monitor and too few staff to do the monitoring – when tougher border controls would greatly simplify the onerous task. Either Blair believes in protecting the country from foreign threats or he doesn't.

I learn from American press sources, in turn citing the French DPSD (Security & Defence) – responsible, along with Interpol, for getting the French Government to close down Sangatte – that certain cells involving the T-branch of MI5 and others like the Force Research Unit (FRU) are to put pressure on the Government to change its asylum

policies. They want to focus intelligence monitoring on our coastal borders instead of vainly trying to cope with it internally. The talk about biometric testing of refugees and the possible use of ID cards is a result of other European security service pressures. But they want future moves to be done without too much fuss being made in the media.

If the government is able to declare war at the drop of a hat, then it should also be able to do what it likes in regard to other areas of public policy. It has already shown that it can muzzle and manipulate the media when it wants. If Blair's main attribute is his skill in propaganda and public relations *pizazz*, then this would be one 'spin' that would be heartily welcomed by the public.

ETHNIC GROVELLER OF THE MONTH



Further to our 'ethnic groveller' feature in our August issue, we received this picture as a new entry to the competition. Once again, the picture shows Prince Charlie, this time with a black 'DeeJay'. We think the expression on the face of the Heir to the Throne makes a powerful case for first prize, which goes to the sender-in, well-known London BNP activist Bob Gertner. Bob will get a free sub for a year.

THE BEAMS IN THEIR EYES

Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye. (New Testament: Matthew, xii, 5)

OPPONENTS of white nationalism have one common characteristic: they love to take, without any justification whatsoever, the moral high ground. Everything they do is so righteous, driven by the purest of motives, against a background of a blemish-free past; whilst, on the other hand, anything to do with white nationalism is associated with the basest of motives, fuelled by hatred and ignorance, with a pedigree of historic crimes unmatched by any other human calumny. Occasionally, however, the wafer-thin veneer of purity among our opponents cracks; an event occurs that sheds light on their true natures and opens up a trail of dark and embarrassing memories that they simply cannot deal with.

ANC turns colonialist

One such event was recently drawn to our attention in the *Daily Telegraph* (13th September). It reports that the impoverished Nama tribe in South Africa is seeking belated compensation for their expulsion from their original home in Alexander Bay following the discovery of diamonds there in 1925. The Nama, who number about 2,000, now live in arid, mountainous scrubland, clustered in four villages of tin huts with no running water, electricity or basic amenities. Meanwhile, the diamonds of their homeland have netted someone billions of pounds.

The African National Congress (ANC), which now supposedly runs South Africa is paraded as the paragon of virtue: freedom fighters, strugglers against colonial exploitation and racism and standardbearers of justice. One might have thought that the Namas would provide the ANC with an ideal cause to demonstrate its zeal for anti-colonialism, justice and racial equality. But no! The ANC government is resisting the Nama claim. As the *Telegraph* reports:-

"... lawyers representing the ANC in court cited an old, colonial-era principle, claiming that the Nama were so 'uncivilised' that they could not enjoy any land rights. Citing the British principle of *terra nullius*, empty land, the lawyers argued that even though the Namas lived in the area they were so backward that they did not warrant ownership rights."

No doubt, the ANC government, like most other governments, is under the sway of powerful financial and commercial interests, but it is interesting that it does not balk in defending those interests with colonial racist principles and terminology. Perhaps the ANC people despise the Nama and really do believe that they are uncivilised. After all, the Namas are a remnant of the almost extinct Bushmen race, the indigenous people of Southern Africa who are quite distinct from the Black Bantu who dominate the region today. The Bushmen are not black, but rather yellowish-brown, and most of them have abnormally large rumps. They are also renowned for

their rock paintings, which are said to show Chinese influence, and they have their own customs and a peculiar language comprising clicks and grunts. Black Bantu tribes invading from the north have driven them out of most of their territory. Indeed, during the 17th Century, Bantu settlers had reached the northern part of

"Many party and progressive organisations in Africa have backed the socialist countries' action. They include the African National Congress of South Africa, the Zimbabwe African People's Union, the Angolan Liberation Movement and the Mozambique Liberation Front."

Exploring the 'liberal' conscience, ROB SMYTH finds a trail of hypocrisies and hidden skeletons

present-day South Africa at about the same time as White settlers began colonising the country from the south. The Bushmen were ravaged by both, but generally their best chance of survival was in areas in which the Whites arrived first.

Today, it is said there are only about 100,000 Bushmen left in South Africa, survivors of several centuries of slaughter, diseases and race-mixing. Nevertheless, it seems that even that small number would be denied justice by the ANC.

Fans of Soviet aggression

Today of course, Nelson Mandela, having perhaps mellowed with age and imprisonment, presents a rather benign public face for the ANC, a friendly and sympathetic figure. It should not be forgotten, however, that he was imprisoned for sabotage and treason. Nor should it be forgotten that the freedom-loving ANC allied itself with the Communist cause, as was starkly shown in 1968, when Soviet tanks and troops (with support from other Communist East European countries) invaded Czechoslovakia and overthrew the mildly reforming government of Alexander Dubcek. At that time the Soviet propaganda paper *Soviet Weekly* (31st August 1968) reported that:-



NAMA WOMEN

Nevertheless, all these organisations continued to receive the enthusiastic support of liberal and leftist parties in the West.

Seretse Khama

Southern Africa has also been the scene of questionable decisions by British Labourites and Liberals, of which they do not like to be reminded today.

The Labour Party, of course, knows no bounds in its indignation against racism, and is all too ready to accuse its opponents of racist attitudes in the past. It has been particularly scathing of the white governments of South Africa (the black population of which was by far the most prosperous and best educated on the continent). So, it is salutary to recall an episode which actually happened whilst a Labour Government was running (or, rather, ruining) the British Empire – the Empire, which they now hold so much in contempt.

Seretse Khama was a young man who was educated at Balliol College, Oxford, where he studied law and seemed to have a promising career ahead of him. However, he also happened to be the hereditary chief of the Ngwato tribe, the most important tribe in the British, Labour-run, Protectorate of Bechuanaland, now known as Botswana. The tribe was semi-autonomous, with territory covering half of Bechuanaland. It was run (as far as the British allowed) by a truly democratic system, with a tribal assembly, the Kgotla, giving effect to the will of the people. In 1949, Seretse Khama decided to marry a white English girl, Ruth Williams. His uncle, Tshekedi Khama, who had been acting as Regent (and very successfully so) for 23 years during Seretse's youth, opposed the marriage because he was, in the words of pro-black commentator John Gunther, in *Inside Africa*...

"...proud of his colour and inheritance even as white men are of theirs, and he did not think it right or wise for the ruling house of Bechuanaland to be mixed, with the possibility of a mulatto heir."

However, Tshekedi put the matter to the Kgotla, who took Seretse's side. Tshekedi accepted this decision but Mr Attlee's Labour Government in faraway Westminster knew better. Seretse was summoned to London in March 1950, where he was told that he would not be allowed to

return to his homeland. He sent a terse telegram to his wife (who was stranded in Bechuanaland):-

"Tribe and myself tricked by British Government - am banned from whole Protectorate."

This was just because Seretse had married a white woman. How racist can you get? Tshekedi was also exiled and, though eventually he was allowed to return as a private citizen, he was barred from political activity. Seretse was permanently excluded from both the chieftainship and his homeland. They are nice people, these socialists - so tolerant and democratic!

Gratifyingly, attempts to persuade the Ngwato to elect a new paramount chief were unsuccessful. The Ngwato people, though thoroughly demoralised, refused to bow the knee to the petty dictators and humbugs of the Labour Party; and the Labour Government had to draft police in from Southern Rhodesia, Basutoland and Swaziland to keep the Ngwato under control.


The fence-sitters

It is so long since there has been a Liberal government that we have to resort to history books for its record. Today, the Liberals masquerade as 'Liberal Democrats' (though they tend to be extremely intolerant of anyone who disagrees with them), and their policies are difficult to discern, as they are serial fence-sitters devoid of real principles. There was a time, however, when they, rather than Labour, played Tweedledee to the Tory Tweedledum. In the last period of Liberal government, from 1905 to 1915, we see policies that reflect virtually a mirror image of their current pomposity and pretensions on race and sex-equality and human rights.

No votes for Blacks

In 1906, the Liberal government granted responsible self-government to the Transvaal and Orange River colonies (former independent Boer republics finally conquered by the British on behalf of the diamond and gold magnates in 1902). The constitution of both new provinces was based on the principle of one white man, one vote. Blacks were given neither seats in the provincial assemblies nor votes.

In 1910, the Liberal government went one better, granting Dominion status to a new Union of South Africa, in which the Transvaal and Orange Free State were joined with Natal and Cape Province. Again, the Constitution provided that only Whites could sit in the Legislative Assembly and, except in the Cape, the electorate was entirely white. (In the Cape, tiny minorities of Blacks and mixed-race Coloureds - no more than 5 per cent and 10 per cent, respectively, of the total electorate - were allowed a vote). Very soon, the new Union passed a Native Lands Act and



SUFFRAGETTE POSTER

This was produced in response to oppressive legislation passed by Parliament in 1913.

other segregationist legislation that paved the way for *Apartheid* later on. All thanks to the Liberal Government.

It was about this time that the contemporary Tory leader, A.J. Balfour, was to say:-

"To suppose that the races of Africa are in any sense the equals of men of European descent, so far as government, as society, as the higher interests of civilisation are concerned, is really, I think, an absurdity." (Quoted by Peter Rowland in *The Last Liberal Governments: The Promised Land, 1905-1910*)

Cat and mouse

If the last Liberal governments paid scant regard to the rights of Blacks, they were even more contemptuous of the suffragettes' campaign to get votes for women. A more active campaign was initiated in 1903 by the formation of the Women's Social and Political Union (WSPU) under the leadership of Emmeline Pankhurst. From 1905, the suffragettes started to heckle meetings of the Liberal Party, and the State responded with prosecutions, fines and imprisonment. As is often the case when faced with a popular movement it cannot suffocate or control, the State tries to criminalise it and put it beyond

the pale. In the case of the suffragettes, this only made matters worse. When Emmeline Pankhurst was imprisoned for six weeks after being ejected from the House of Commons, two of her followers smashed the windows of No. 10 Downing Street. The publicity engendered and the heavy-handed reaction of the State encouraged more such attacks, especially so as the suffragettes soon worked out that it was safer to break windows than it was to hold marches and demonstrations on which they might be physically attacked by cowardly mobs.

Eventually, illegal activities extended to arson attacks and other serious acts of vandalism, bringing in their wake more prison sentences. At this point, suffragettes in prison began the tactic of going on hunger strike. The Liberal Government responded first with forcible feeding, and then with the Temporary Discharge for Ill-Health Act 1913, a particularly vicious measure which became known as the 'Cat and Mouse' Act. It enabled the authorities to release prisoners temporarily when they became seriously ill through starvation or forced feeding, and then incarcerate them again when they got better. It was characterised as a subtle form of torture and it remains a dark shadow over the Liberal conscience.

Feet of clay

When they speak in their high moral tones, we know that Labour and Liberal spokesmen in particular have feet of clay. They speak for the moment and vent their indignation against racism, inequality, xenophobia, third world debt and other fashionable causes. However, we have only to think of what they have said and done in the past and wonder what they will be saying and doing in the future, when the 'wind of change' starts blowing in the opposite direction!

Of all villainy, there is none more base than that of the hypocrite, who, at the moment he is most false, takes care to appear most virtuous. (Cicero, *De Officiis*. Bk. I, ch. 13, sec. 41.)

THOUGHT FOR THE MONTH

... the liberal reveals that, aside from all his other pernicious characteristics, he is a hypocrite and a coward. Intellectually, he is like the school bully who goes strutting around bragging about his prowess in combat and, as if to underline it, intimidates people he knows to be no match for him. But when he finds himself confronted by an adversary he suspects may give him a real fight he backs away. Why will the liberal, whose whole philosophy is supposedly founded on 'reason', not submit himself to the basic test of the 'reasonableness' of that philosophy? The answer is predictable: 'fascism' again! One never debates, you see, with 'fascists' (meaning all non-liberals)...

Thus does the liberal, whose entire literature whines with protests against 'totalitarianism', reveal himself... to be the worst type of totalitarian.

JOHN TYNDALL (*The Eleventh Hour*)

FRIENDS OF SPEARHEAD


Friends of *Spearhead* is a support group that has been formed for the purpose of ensuring our magazine's continued survival.

Members of Friends of *Spearhead* pay a subscription of a minimum of £10 a month, in return for which they may, if they wish, receive five copies of each monthly issue for redistribution (by whatever means they prefer). This subscription may be paid by cheque or direct debit, in which case our bank details will be supplied.

In addition, Friends of *Spearhead* undertakes certain other promotions, details of which are advertised as they occur.

We hope very much that our readers and supporters, not only in the UK but around the world, will rally to help us in this project.

Friends of *Spearhead* can be contacted at PO Box 2471, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 4DT.



The Editor
'Spearhead'
PO Box 2471
Hove
E. Sussex BN3 4DT

SIR: The second half of the life of Leni Riefenstahl, who died last month at the age of 101, was dominated by unrealised projects largely caused by political pressures which prevented her from working as a filmmaker during the post-war years. Let's for a moment assume that the Allied version of the events of World War II – which of course has been augmented and added to since the end of that war – is correct. If Riefenstahl really did misuse her talents to glorify a monstrous régime, then the argument runs that it was justifiable to treat her in such a shoddy manner.

But Soviet director Sergei Eisenstein worked in the service of a régime whose victims far exceeded by any reckoning those of Hitler's Germany, and whose atrocities were perpetrated over a much longer period and were not restricted to wartime. Strange to say, Eisenstein's reputation has never suffered, and the foregoing points are never mentioned in connection with his name. A clearer case of double standards could hardly exist.

One of Riefenstahl's stupider critics remarked that beauty itself had become suspect due to her poetic documentaries. How gratifying to know that this is the case, so that we may all live contentedly in a cultural world of dissected cows, unmade beds, shabby concrete and even shabbier politicians.

Riefenstahl's *Triumph of the Will* has only very rarely appeared on British television. In our democratic, liberal country, the British public is not even allowed make up its own mind on this undoubted, if controversial, masterpiece.

Even when Riefenstahl was working as a stills photographer, taking pictures of the dances and customs of the Nuba tribe in the Sudan, she was still accused of having a 'fascist aesthetic', whatever that may be. She continued to visit Sudan until about three years ago, staying in simple and primitive villages. In like manner, she also displayed great verve and energy by taking up deep-sea diving at an advanced age.

Riefenstahl will outlast her poisonous critics. Her work – from the early films she made as an actress such as *The Holy Mountain* to mature works like *Olympische spiele* – is filled with the grace and spirituality of German Romanticism.

IAN BUCKLEY
Liverpool, Merseyside

SIR: The anti-Euro lobby – with which I am broadly in sympathy – sometimes undermines its case by going overboard with

false claims. One of these is that the Union of Europe was a concept favoured by Hitler.

Not so. Michael Burleigh, in an article in *The Sunday Times News Review* on the 13th July this year, put the record straight. Speaking of Hitler's second book, never published in his lifetime, he said that it contained "his (Hitler's) most sustained attack on the pan-European movement, which he dismissed as 'a fantastic, historically impossible childishness.'"

Under the duress of war, when all available resources had to be mobilised to compensate for Germany's growing shortage of manpower and other assets to combat the combined might of the Allies, non-German Europeans sympathetic to Hitler's aims were recruited to augment the German forces, particularly on the Eastern Front. For obvious reasons of political tactics, the recruiting appeals exploited the idea of a single 'European' struggle against Bolshevism, and recruits were told that they were fighting for 'Europe' rather than just for Germany – which in a certain sense they were. However, this is wholly different from a merged European super-state of the kind now being pursued by Tony Blair and his continental masters. This never was a Hitler aim, and it is dishonest to suggest otherwise.

DAVID STONE
Warley, West Midlands

SIR: As Hutton mows the meadows of the Kelly fiasco, more and more frightened vermin run for cover behind forged dossiers, trumped-up intelligence, wild recriminations and downright lies. Westminster has become a warren of perfidy.

Dr. Kelly's death was, of course, a cause for deep regret, but since (apparently) he died by his own hand what can the purpose of the enquiry be?

Hutton can only be a red herring to draw attention away from the questions that really matter: What was the reason for the attack on Iraq? Why was Tone such a zealous advocate of a war that had no economic, political or moral justification? Those are the questions that Hutton ought to be asking.

And to keep things in proportion, Kelly was only one man. What of the hundreds, perhaps thousands, of men, women and children killed and maimed by coalition bombs?

Soldiers and civilians are still being killed and maimed, and all to no valid purpose. In spite of the stage-managed welcome for British and US troops, we all know that every hand in Iraq is turned against coalition forces – and who can blame the Iraqis for resisting invaders of their country?

N.G. CHARNLEY
Blackpool, Lancs.

SIR: It is hardly suprising that the multi-racial occupying 'coalition' forces in Iraq continue to suffer losses almost on a daily basis in that unfortunate country.

Frankly, if I were an Iraqi I would do all in my power to help my country regain its freedom. In fact, I have nothing but admir-

ation for those Iraqis who are continuing to fight the foreign invader.

Since the illegal attack on Saddam Hussein's country, matters have gone from bad to appalling. For example, there have been attempts to install an oil pipeline from Iraq through to Israel and Turkey – the first being particularly obnoxious to Iraqis as Saddam always gave the equivalent of £25,000 compensation to Palestinian widows or mothers of murdered freedom-fighters. Apart from that, the Iraqis are now being told that the invaders wish to involve a peacekeeping force (yes, it is seriously referred to in those terms!) of 30 different nationalities, thereby adding to the bedlam. PHILIP FORDER-WHITE
Shaftsbury, Dorset

SIR: At a time when this country is rapidly descending to Third World standards in its provision of health care, education, roads and transport, and where crime is ever more rampant; and when we are being flooded with alien invaders – at such a time as this, which is ripe for a populist movement of a nationalist character, what do we see?

We see the National Front a mere shell of its former strength, broken up by the duplicity of renegades within, as happened in the 1970s and 1980s, and we see the BNP being destroyed by a leader and his clique whose every act and speech betray what looks like an ulterior purpose: the destruction of a party which might be attracting the support of millions of disaffected people in this stinking, multi-racial society.

Nick Griffin shows his true colours in expelling John Tyndall and victimising others who founded the BNP, forged its policies and laid the foundations of its strength and what electoral success it has recently been enjoying.

B.J. CLIFTON
Cardiff

SIR: In 2001 the Labour Government passed a law making it illegal for British expatriates abroad to send cash to British political parties. However, Sir Sean Connery, who supports the Scots Nationalists, who seek to break up Britain, argued that the new law was designed to stop him giving money to the SNP.

It seems to me that the law was primarily designed to prevent expatriates in the US, Canada, etc., giving cash to the British National Party. Labour doesn't see the SNP as a threat; it is the BNP they're worried about.

This is seen to be true by the recent donation of £50,000 given by Connery to the SNP. Labour's law does not seem to prevent this. Thus it's OK for an expatriate Brit to give cash to a party that seeks to divide the British Nation but not to do so to one that seeks to keep us united.

What was it the old trade union slogan said? "In unity lies strength." Now leading trade unionists sing Billy Bragg's song, "Take down the Union Jack, Jack." HARRY MULLIN
Glasgow

Welcome competition

It was flattering to read that a prestigious national newspaper has decided to offer its readers a daily column bearing the same title as our own. Early examination shows that the new entrant will consist almost entirely of trivia – which shows that the name is the only thing we have in common.

The good old days

The Nationalist Party of the old South Africa was paternalistic and practical. It dealt with the seemingly intractable problems of a mixed-race society with care and confidence. In short, it knew precisely what it was doing, and did it well. But, even though it appeared to have a firm grip on internal affairs, it could not, in the bitter end, protect its peoples from the depredations of the international trouble-makers, and finally handed over a prosperous economy to Mandela and his bandits of the ANC. This apology for a political party campaigned on the slogan "Jobs, jobs, Jobs, and a better life for all." However, the outcome of its rule to date has been the loss of a million jobs and a reduction in life-expectancy. Would it not be a wonderful world where people could be prosecuted for not minding their own business?

The power of the Press...

Those wishing to plumb the very depths of journalistic lunacy need no longer resort to *The Guardian* or *The Independent*. Mary Ann Sieghart, writing for *The Times*, is enthralled with statistics showing that London now attracts more international immigrants than New York or Los Angeles – in fact nearly three times as many as New York proportionate to its population. Says Mary: "It's a huge compliment to our capital city that so many foreigners want to move here. London clearly has a buzz now that marks it among the top cities in the world, possibly even *the* top city." She is clearly beside herself with enthusiasm when she draws our attention to the American investment bankers, Nigerian security guards, Somali office cleaners, Filipina maids, Slovakian *au pairs* and sundry other foreign waiters and shop assistants, who have decided to settle here. Not a word, of

THE WAY WE LIVE NOW

Some observations on contemporary society
by JUNIUS

course, about the muggings, drug-running, ritual killings, sexual assaults and violent gang warfare that have become part of everyday life in our ancient Metropolis. After digesting, as best we could, all this mindless garbage, we were constrained to send the lady an e-mail suggesting that her 'vibrant capital city' had become "a refuge for the scum of the earth from all over the globe."

... and the state of the Nation

No doubt, when Mary Ann herself falls victim to the violence of our multicultural society, she will explain to her long-suffering readers that her assailants were really quite charming, but clearly deprived, disadvantaged and burdened with problems that people had not properly understood. Meantime, maybe she should just glance at some of the headlines taken from the newspaper that pays her wages:-

British immigrants will need million new homes – Housing problems in the South East will be unmanageable – Has the Government given up on illegal immigrants? – Ministers have lost control over who enters Britain – Illegal immigrants go free to keep asylum figures low – 8 out of 10 rejected refugees still in UK – Britain faces new wave of immigrants – Record numbers granted right to be British – Africa is main source of new HIV cases in Britain – Ethnic minorities spread out from cities to suburbs – Prisons crisis as foreign inmates soar – Cocaine scanners target Caribbean mules in transit.

Regarding this last item, our less well informed readers should know that a 'mule' in this instance is a West Indian lady who has ingested packets of dangerous drugs before entering the UK. Of the 350 inmates of Morton Hall women's prison in Lincolnshire, 65 per cent are foreigners and, of these, 140 are from Jamaica.

A correction

In *Spearhead* Number 398 (April 2002), we advised readers that *Bombers over Baghdad*, starring Mr. Mel Gibson was scheduled for release in 2005. We now understand that, due to unforeseen circumstances, shooting of this epic has been abandoned. However, casting is now well advanced for a replacement, provisionally titled *Tough Times in Tikrit*, which will definitely not be shot on location! It will be noted from the above that the Junius dossier, compiled from *Forbes Magazine* and other extremist neo-conservative sources, a full year before the invasion, indicated that Bush and Blair would go to war regardless of any opposition encountered anywhere!

Who did what?

The Hutton enquiry into the death of Dr. Kelly has provided the media with a field day, and only the most dedicated readers and viewers will have toiled through all the thousands of words either spoken in the courtroom or composed by hacks with nothing better to do. We quickly gained an impression of several rats abandoning a sinking ship, and taking pot shots at one another while swimming for the shore. Even so, we must not forget that this plethora of words was all about the necessity to justify a violent act of aggression against a country that offered no threat to us. We and our brave servicemen are the ultimate losers. What a relief for the rest of the world to learn that the Bush terror machine now appears to be running short of cash!

A Student's Tale...

Charlotte whooped with joy. Although failing to get as many as one right answer out of six, she had been awarded a C grade in Mathematics. Not that the result was altogether important. After all, psychologists never did need much algebra. But, goodness, some of those

tasks set by her university tutors were really beyond a joke. Fortunately, Dad had been able to help out with a few hundred quid to buy her some dab-hand, tailor-made essays on the internet, which she was able to pass off as her own work. And, let's face it, the night life in the town was fantastic. The tough part came when she joined the 215,000 young psychology graduates looking for a job.

Baked beans, frozen cod, own brand digestives, Chilean Merlot on special offer; the conveyor platform trundled on. Charlotte glanced at her watch: 5.45 – just another 15 minutes and her stint would be over. A couple of check-outs away from hers, Nathan – a mother's pride and joy who had 'majored' in media studies – was already closing down. And all this thanks to Tony's insistence that 50 per cent of young folk should benefit from higher education!

... and a classroom crisis

Budget shortfalls are blamed for a 3,500-a-year loss in teaching posts in secondary schools. Smaller classes under New Labour? Rising educational standards? What a load of poppycock! But this is just the part of the iceberg that we can see. Overall, it is reckoned that up to 25,000 teachers are quitting the profession every year, and a major factor here is pupil indiscipline, with the introduction of crazy new government initiatives a strong runner up. We are not, under existing legislation, allowed to speculate as to the reasons why there is so often chaos in the establishments where our children are sent to be prepared for their future lives. Nor are we allowed to comment on the theory that the less you know the 'cooler' you will appear in the eyes of your classmates. But this we will say: unless drastic steps are taken to stop the rot, it will not be so many years before what is already perceived to be a disaster becomes a farce.

Finding the wrong words

"All terrorist attacks, whatever their justification, are morally reprehensible and wholly indefensible." No points if you thought that the speaker was John Prescott. In fact, the howler of the month came from Kofi Annan, Secretary-General to the United Nations.

Alfred's Metres of Boethius (ed. Bill Griffiths) £14.95. Clarity of text and informative notes give this study a most approachable presentation of Old English verse. King Alfred rebuilt the Latin verses from Boethius's *On The Consolation of Philosophy* into a new alliterative poetry.

Alien Menace, The (Lt. Col. A.H. Lane) £4.50. Early warnings against immigration. First printed 1928.

An Eye for An Eye (John Sack) £17.95. The story of the Jews who sought revenge for the alleged 'Holocaust'.

Anglo-American Establishment, The (Carroll Quigley) £12.95. A factual appraisal of the realities of power politics and a study of the groups that work behind the scenes to influence events.

Anti-Semitism and the Babylonian Connection (Des. Griffin) £9.75. An examination of the historical roots of modern Judaism.

Aspects of Anglo-Saxon Magic (Bill Griffiths) £14.95. A neat division between mainstream and occult, rational and superstitious, Christian and Pagan, is not always easy to discern. The Church outlawed practices they considered evil like divination, folk-healing and spells, while at the same time adopting similar rituals themselves.

Behind Communism in Africa (Ivor Benson) £3.30. A look at the forces that were against White South Africa.

Best of Instauration 1977, The (Wilmot Robertson, Editor) £14.75. Probably the best and most thought-provoking journal to appear on the American scene. The 1978 compilation also available at the same price.

Best Witness (Michael Collins Piper) £17.95. Mel Memelstein and the trial and the triumph of historical revisionism.

Better than Nostradamus (Barry R. Smith) £9.75. Sub-titled 'The Secret World Takeover'. The evidence is presented and many startling facts are brought to the reader's attention in a methodical fashion. A fascinating work with emphasis on the Christian aspect.

Beyond Tears (Catherine Buckle) £14.95. The tragic story of the post-colonial history of Rhodesia, with the country's reversion to barbarism, famine and horror.

Bible and Race, The (Kenneth McKilliam) £1.50. This former colonial administrator and British Army captain wrote this book to enable clerics and others to make sense of the bible by understanding its racial message.

Biology of the Race Problem (Professor W.C. George) £3.30. A comprehensive introduction to racial differences with indisputable scientific data.

Blowing the Whistle (Paul van Buitenen) £12.99. One man's fight against fraud within the European Commission.

Britain First £8.00. Verbatim report on the great Earls Court Peace Rally, 1939.

Blackshirts on Sea (J.A. Booker) £19.50. A pictorial record of the British Union pre-war summer camps with comprehensive text.

Break His Bones (Bradley R. Smith) £13.00. Reveals the systematic attempts at the suppression of historical revisionism in the USA.

The prices given here include postal charges for dispatch within the British Isles. For postage overseas please enquire before ordering.

Payments should be made to 'Spearhead Books' and sent to the above address.

Spearhead Books handles works by numerous and varied independent authors. It should not need stating that the publisher of Spearhead may not necessarily endorse all the contents of these works.

Written by a man described as on of the "Top Ten Extremists" by the Zionist Anti-Defamation League because he dared to call for an open debate on the 'Holocaust'.

British Peace and How to Get it, The (Oswald Mosley) £4.00. A proposal for peace published after the Second World War broke out.

British Press, The ('Boreas') £2.00. Although this book was published in 1939, readers will spot an uncanny similarity with the situation in Britain today.

Broken Cross, The (Piers Compton) £12.95. The hidden hand in the Vatican and its subversion of the Catholic Church.

By Way of Deception (Victor Ostrovsky) £11.00. A former Mossad (Israeli Intelligence Service) agent defects and tells his amazing story.

Captain McKilliam Memorial Archive, The (Captain K.R. McKilliam) £10.00. Four booklets of particular interest to Christians and conspiracy students.

Captive State (George Monbiot) £15.95. The corporate take-over of Britain today revealed.

Case for David Irving, The. (Nigel Jackson) £13.75. An exposure of the selective censorship of history and free speech which proceeds at our peril.

Churchill's War Vol. I (David Irving) £23.95. The first book in a two-part set. This book changes the way World War II is viewed, forever.

Churchill's War Vol. II (David Irving) £29.30. The history of the middle and later years of World War II.

Conquest Through Immigration (George W. Robnett) £13.00. How Zionism turned Palestine into a Jewish state.

Controversy of Zion, The (Douglas Reed) £18.95. This, Douglas Reed's last book, contains the summation of all he had learnt during his long life, which combined a great literary career with extensive travel.

Crimes and Mercies (James Bacque) £10.50. The fate of the German civilians under allied occupation 1945-1950.

Dark-Age Naval Power (John Haywood) £14.95. The reassessment of Frankish and Anglo-Saxon seafaring activity.

Dartmoor Massacre, The (Vivian Bird) £6.00. In 1812 American prisoners were held in Dartmoor

prison. This is the account of their fate.

Death of King Arthur (Trans. by James Cable) £6.95. Set in the twilight of the Arthurian world. The knights meet at the round table after their quest for the grail.

Did Six Million Really Die? (Richard Harwood) £1.50. Controversial and yet good news for all victims and students of the 'Holocaust'.

Diamond in the Dust (by his political colleagues) £10.00. 100pp plus 4pp colour. An appreciation of Ian Stuart, his life and work.

Dilemma of Inter-racial Relations, The (Gayre of Gayre) £4.00. An analysis of the problems of forcing people of different races together, and of the results of the efforts of compulsion.

En Route to Global Occupation (Gary H. Kah) £12.75. A high-ranking government liaison officer exposes the secret agenda for world unification.

Empire of the City, The (E.C. Knuth) £6.95. An examination of the role of the international élite, based in the City of London, in advancing globalisation.

Enemies of the Queen (Kitty Little Ph.D.) £2.00. Written with the author's personal knowledge and experiences of the 'enemy within'.

Ethnostate, The (Wilmot Robertson) £15.95. A brilliant blueprint for a post-liberal society where race becomes a constructive binding agent. A book to provoke much thought on why you think as you do.

Eugenic Manifesto (James L. Hart) £1.95. An interesting argument that economic and moral standards can be raised by encouraging the birth rate of the more intelligent and productive elements within society.

Evil Good Men Do, The (Jeffrey Hamm) £10.00. About crucial decisions by governments that have led to the ruin of Britain.

Fable of the Ducks and the Hens, The. £5.00.

A colourful cartoon-style A4-size book telling the story of 'Asylum Seekers' in a modern parable form. An excellent gift for children.

Facing the Abyss (A.K. Chesterton) £3.50.



The first leader of the National Front reveals secret forces behind world events.

Fatima and the Great Conspiracy (Deidre Manifold) £10.75. An attempt to explain the meaning and truth behind the vision.

Fiend and Felon (Gerd Honsik) £10.50. An exposure of Simon Wiesenthal. The author shows the unsavoury side of this strange character and how perjury and murder follow in his footsteps.

Final Judgement (Michael Collins Piper) £20.00. A best-seller from America. Piper claims that the Mossad, the feared Israeli intelligence service, was involved in the assassination of JFK.

French Revolution, The (Nesta Webster) £19.00. An excellent historical account, with descrip-



tions of the horrors that set the scene for the more terrible events of the communist revolts in other parts of the world.

Global Manipulators, The (R. Eringer) £9.00. The real power of the internationalists exposed.

Great Money Reformers (L. Wise) £9.00. Three booklets which give details of the lives and ideas of Silvio Gesell, Arthur Kitson and Frederick Soddy. All deal with the 'Money Question'. A valuable background for all those who are interested in Social Credit ideas.

Gruesome Harvest (Ralph Franklin Keeling) £5.25. How Allied policy-makers treated their defeated foe. A compelling story of 'victors' justice'.

History and Biology (Prof. Revilo P. Oliver) £1.30. Tracing the history of mankind and its eventual fate if some form of eugenics is not brought into population management.

Hoax of the 20th Century, The (Prof. A.R. Butz) £15.00. The most famous, and indeed seminal, work on 'Holocaust' revisionism.

Holocaust Affirmers (Alexander Baron) £10.75. A hard look at the people pushing the 'Holocaust' stories.

Holocaust Industry, The (Norman G. Finkelstein) £18.00. Reflections on the exploitation of Jewish suffering.

Holocaust, The: 120 Questions Answered (Charles Weber) £2.00. Fact and fable examined and questioned.

I Saw Poland Betrayed (A.B. Lane) £7.00. Exposing the truth of the terrible tragedy of Poland.

Imperium (Francis P. Yockey) £26.75. After his extensive travels in Europe after the Second World War, Yockey produced this work, which is well known in American nationalist circles. Sub-titled 'The Philosophy of History and Politics', the book was a landmark in post-war patriotic thinking.

Innocent at Dachau (Joseph Halow) £16.95. An eye-witness account of a court reporter.

Is There Intelligent Life on Earth? (Prof. Revilo P. Oliver) £4.95. A study of the utter stupidity of the masses and the suicidal doctrines they follow.

Land Rights and Birth Rights (Peter B. English) £12.00. The great Australian hoax. An examination of the rights to ownership of former aboriginal land.

Legacy of John Lennon (David A. Noebel) £10.00. Charming or harming a generation?

Liars Ought to Have Good Memories (Alexander Baron) £4.95. An accurate exposure of the workings of the Jewish lie factory, otherwise known as *Searchlight* Magazine.

Life of John Birch, The (Robert Welch) £8.00. The life story of the man who gave his name to one of the most important anti-communist movements in America.

Lifting the Lid off the ADL (William Pierce) £2.30. An astounding revelation about the real haters within the media.

Lord of the Rings. (J.R.R. Tolkien) £16.75. A novel based on British folklore, describing a mythical world and the battle between good and evil.

Mead-Hall, The (Stephen Pollington) £14.95. Communal meals were an important feature of Anglo-Saxon Society. Some were ritual and

others informal. A comprehensive study of the subject is here presented.

Mind Britain's Business (Capt. Robert Gordon Canning) £6.00. A foreign policy to bring peace and security. Pre-war but still relevant today.

Mosley's Blackshirt Airmen (Keith Thompson) £3.00. About aircraft makers, airmen and war heroes.

Moses Hess (Shlomo Avineri) £6.50. A study of this famous writer and thinker who became the prophet of Communism and Zionism

Motorways for Britain (A. Raven Thompson) £1.50. Constructive solutions for traffic chaos. First published in 1937.

Music in the Third Reich (A.V. Schaffenberg) £2.50. A fascinating history of awakened talent.

My Awakening (David Duke) £24.00. One of the finest books currently in print, which deals with all the issues of concern to white people.

My Banned Holocaust Interview (Carlo Mattogno) £6.50. A leading Italian history revisionist had his studies and conclusions banned. This is his work published privately.

New Unhappy Lords, The (A.K. Chesterton) £6.00. A brilliant exposé of Britain's decline and some solutions to save reverse the trend.

Norse Poems (W.H. Auden and P.B. Taylor) £7.60. Old Icelandic poems translated to capture the rhythmic quality of the originals.

Norse Tradition, The (Pete Jennings) £6.25. Explaining the Norse tradition and the spiritual paths of paganism amongst our forefathers.

Occupation (Paul Comben) £3.00. A book of nationalist poetry.

Our Financial Masters (A. Raven Thompson) £3.30. A pre-war look at the money power and its control.

Pawns in the Game (William Guy Carr) £14.95. A classic conspiracy expose.

Plagiarism and the Culture War (Theodore Papas) £14.95. The writings of Martin Luther King Jnr. and other prominent Americans.

Policeman's Narrative, A (Henry A. Clark) £7.00. About witchcraft and murder in Zimbabwe.

Prodigal Genius (John J. O'Neill) £18.50. The life of Nikola Tesla, inventor extraordinary.

Race Books (J.B. Isherwood) £4.00. Four books entitled *Man's Racial Nature*; *Race and Kinship*; *Race and Politics* and *Religion and the Racial Controversy*.

Rebirth of England and English, The (Fr. Andrew Phillips) £4.95. The vision of the Dorset poet, William Barnes (1801-86). In search of our post industrial age, the folk nationalist will learn much from this book.


Rebuilding Russia (Alexander Solzhenitsyn) £8.00. Reflections and proposals from this talented and extraordinary man.

Recovery (Kerry Bolton) £2.30. The story of Gottfried Feder and how Germany broke out of the economic recession of the early 1930s.

Revisionist, The (Journal for Critical Historical Inquiry) £10.00. An exceptional first volume of the latest findings of researchers into the 'Holocaust' and the issues surrounding it. A 'must' for all those involved in 'Holocaust' studies. A-4 size, 110 pages.

Robin Hood (J. Ritson) £11.50. Ancient poems, songs and ballads. First published in 1795.

Rudolf Report, The (Germar Rudolf) £20.00. Over 450 pages. An Expert report on chemical and technical aspects of the alleged 'gas chambers' of Auschwitz.



Secret Societies and Subversive Movements (Nesta Webster) £17.95.

Argues the case for suspecting a secret directing influence behind most subversive organisations.

Seeing Red - Being Green (Denis Hill) £6.90. The autobiography of a working-class man who began his life as a communist and, due to a process of logical deduction and experience, developed views that would make him welcome at any gathering of the BNP.

Serpents Walk (Randolph D. Calverhall) £6.95. A fictional story of a revolution in 2049. This time, as the author says, "The good guys win."

Soldiers Against Death and the Devil (Horst Slesina) £6.00. A soldier's tale of the epic struggle between Europe and Bolshevism.

Stalin's War of Extermination 1941-45 (Joachim Hoffman) £30.00. This book details the German army's desperate attempt to frustrate Soviet plans to subjugate Europe.

Standardbearers (Various Authors) £6.95. Twenty essays on writers who have influenced the thinking of the British New Right.

Talmud Unmasked, The (Rev. I.B. Pranaitis) £11.00. This much talked-of Jewish religious book researched and translated as a useful tool in the understanding of modern Jewish aspirations.

Tastes of Anglo-Saxon England (Mary Savelli) £4.95. 46 recipes that will enable you to enjoy flavours widely known in Anglo-Saxon England but rarely experienced today.

Temple of Wotan (Ron McVan) £18.50. The mysteries of antiquity. The ethnic spiritual mythos of the Euro-Pagan world explained with the ceremonies and rituals of Wotanism.

Towards World Government (Deirdre Manifold) £10.75. A timely warning of the coming world dictatorship.

Western Intelligensia and the Soviet Union (D. Heald) £2.50. A selection of quotes praising Stalin and the 'Red' dictatorships in Eastern Europe by a range of liberal 'intellectuals'. These are the words that their authors want forgotten.

White Fang/Call of the Wild (Jack London) £5.50. Two of London's masterpieces on the harsh Yukon Territory which explore the kingdom of the wolf.

Why I Took Up Arms Against Bolshevism (Lt. Gen. Andrei Vlasov) £6.00. The tale of the life and death of the Russians who fought against Stalin.

Now a seat in Essex!

ON THURSDAY, September 4th came the British National Party breakthrough in Essex.

Nicholas Geri, 47, a building maintenance manager, shook the establishment by winning a seat for the BNP on Thurrock Council. Mr. Geri contested the Grays Riverside ward, previously a Labour stronghold. He was a very clear winner, gaining 552 votes. The Tories were a long way second, with 382, Labour third with 374 and the LibDems last with 173. The BNP vote came to over 37 per cent of the poll.


So shaken was the Labour Party that one of its spokesmen, Richard Howitt MEP, said the voters had been 'fooled'. Just what has Labour been doing to the voters all these years?

Councillor Geri said: "We bring

common sense. Things have gone the wrong way and the way that people don't want them to go. That is why they voted for us. We will look at asylum problems, crime and the causes of crime."

Politicians from the establishment parties lined up to whinge about this landmark victory for the BNP. Alan Olive, local Labour Party regional director, said that the BNP was "nasty, extremist and racist," and that it "got in narrowly(?!!!) on the back of empty promises, low turnout and bogus respectability." Earnshaw Palmer, a black Liberal Democrat councillor, said: "This is a sad day for democracy." Tory local government spokesman Eric Pickles MP said the result had left him "sad and angry."

Just why the day of the BNP's Thurrock result should be deemed "a sad day for democracy" would seem a mystery to most people. At last, local voters have a councillor who represents their real views on the things that matter!



NICK GERI
"We bring common sense."

Listen to nationalist radio!

Send International Reply Coupon for broadcast details to:-

NATIONAL VANGUARD BOOKS, Box 330, Hillsboro, WV 24946, U.S.A.

Internet: www.natvan.com & www.natall.com

Read Spearhead on the Internet!

You can obtain the best articles from *Spearhead* by visiting the *Spearhead* website at:-

www.spearhead-uk.com

Glitch in last issue

We must apologise to readers for some thoroughly unsatisfactory formatting of text in a number of articles in our September issue, which resulted in unwanted hyphens in several places and excessive spaces in others. This was due to a glitch that occurred in the process of our printer copying the issue from the CD that we supplied to him. Our own record shows that the formatting was correct when the copy left our editorial office.

We hope this will not occur again.

The Eleventh Hour

The Eleventh Hour has been described as the 'Bible' of the British National Party. First published in 1988, the latest (1998) edition has been updated to take in the many new developments on the political scene occurring since. Written by the founder of the British National Party, John Tyndall, the book gives comprehensive coverage of all the major current issues affecting Britain. It delves into the ideologies of liberalism, conservatism and the left, and also examines that of British Nationalism and its background. It contains extensive analyses of the British economy and political system. It looks at issues connected with freedom and order, the mass media, the environment, race and immigration, Northern Ireland, the Commonwealth, foreign policy and defence. It also gives a detailed outline of the development of the BNP and its predecessor organisations in Britain.

The *Eleventh Hour* runs to 537 pages. It is partly autobiographical, giving an account of the author's origins, early political awakening and subsequent life's work.

Price: Hardback £25.00 plus £4.58 p&p; softback £17.50 plus £3.67 p&p. Please make out cheques to Albion Press and send to PO Box 2471, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 4DT.

How to obtain *Spearhead*

Make sure of your regular copy of *Spearhead* by becoming a subscriber. Please fill in the form here and send it to us, together with payment, as directed. Please note also the rates for bulk-buyers.

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

ENCLOSED SUBSCRIPTION OF.....

PLUS DONATION (IF ANY) OF.....

The following rates are for 12 issues (please tick box where applicable):-

British Isles £24.00 ☐; Overseas surface mail £26.50 ☐; Air mail Europe £28.50 ☐; Air mail elsewhere £35.00 ☐.


PLEASE NOTE: These overseas rates apply if remittance is in Pounds Sterling. If remittance is in any other currency, an additional charge of £4.50 is required in the case of cheques and money orders and £2.50 in the case of banknotes, these paying for banker's commission and charges.

Discounts for bulk purchases can be obtained as follows:-

10-19 copies £1.10 each; 20-49 copies £1.00 each; 50-99 copies 83p each; 100-199 copies 69p each; 200-499 copies 60p each; 500 copies 55p each. For advice on postal rates for these quantities please contact our office.

All cheques and postal or money orders should be made out to *Spearhead* and sent to PO Box 2471, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 4DT. Please do not include payment for *Spearhead* in a remittance which includes payment for other items.

JOHN TYNDALL



The book you must read if you want to find out what John Tyndall and the BNP stand for

Friends of *Spearhead* meet for most enjoyable annual gathering

THE Friends of *Spearhead*, the support group set up to ensure our magazine's survival, enjoyed their best-ever annual gathering last month. The occasion was a buffet-lunch organised at a very pleasant location in the West Midlands. This year 50 were present – a record. Although the invitations to guests were expanded this year, there was still a record turnout from actual members, who have increased in number over recent months.

After everyone had helped themselves to the ample fare, there were speeches by Graham John, Richard Edmonds and John Tyndall, with John Morse acting as chairman. Graham John, organiser of Southend BNP branch, gave an amusing account of a run-in he had had with a particularly hostile local journalist, who was dumfounded when he asserted that he did not hate black people!

Richard Edmonds gave tribute to *Spearhead*, reminding those present that our magazine had now been going for nearly 40 years. He spoke of the pioneers who had founded and built the BNP (modestly omitting to mention that he was a major pioneer himself – an omission later corrected by John Tyndall). He spoke of what a hard job it is to undertake the pioneer work of a party like the BNP and how many later recruits to the party fail to appreciate this. He said that the recent expulsion of Mr. Tyndall demonstrated that the BNP was in crisis, and that *Spearhead* had a vital role to play in helping to bring the party through that crisis.

John Tyndall began by thanking all those



John Tyndall addresses the gathering. 50 were present.

whose support had enabled *Spearhead* to survive through difficult times. He went on to speak of his expulsion from the party, and he affirmed his determination to contest this through the courts. To those who had asked him if he was dismayed by this turn of events he replied that one should never be dismayed in situations like this. Life is a struggle, he said, and those not fit for struggle will not survive. Sometimes, he went on, you are up, sometimes you are down, and you must learn to cope with it. "I

intend to fight these people," he said referring to his enemies in the BNP, "and I intend to win!"

Due to some late arrivals, the speeches had started later than scheduled and, unfortunately, had to be cut short to meet the time limit for vacating the room the Friends had booked. Nevertheless, for some time afterwards there was plenty of socialising in the main bar. The gathering broke up in the late afternoon and, by general consent, a thoroughly good time was had by all.

ON the very evening of the British National Party's stunning victory in Thurrock, the party held its branch meeting in nearby Southend – at a new prestige venue.

Chairman Rob Smyth opened the meeting welcoming members and the many new people who had come along to meet the party. He went on to outline some of the problems in the town, drawing particular attention to council taxes.

He then handed over to organiser Graham John, who ran over recent activities and outlined future plans. The branch was planning a local leaflet which contained information concerning the misuse of council tax by the local authority. Graham then asked for agreement to provide £500 from Southend branch funds to the fighting of next year's Euro Election.

After a break, the chairman introduced the guest speaker for the evening, BNP party chairman Nick Griffin. Mr. Griffin spoke of the experiences of people up and

GRIFFIN AT SOUTHEND

down the country who were suffering from multi-culturalism. He gave a memorable example of two men attacked by Asians who, when they described their assailants as 'Pakis', were denied medical attention

and later arrested for 'racism'.

He ended saying that the BNP was the only hope and the last chance for Britain, but he knew we could do it, and the rapid growth in Southend was the proof.

He received extended applause and was thanked for travelling from Wales to attend the meeting. During his speech the news came through of the great victory in Thurrock – to loud applause from everyone.

SPEARHEAD SUPPORT FUND

Income from the sales of our magazine is not enough to cover full production and administrative costs. We therefore rely on regular donations from our supporters so that we may remain solvent.

Also, because of the controversial nature of the opinions expressed in these columns, it is impossible to induce wholesale distributors to handle the magazine. Hence another need for additional financial support.

Please send all contributions to *Spearhead*, PO Box 2471, Hove, East Sussex BN3 4DT. Please note that receipts are not normally sent for donations of less than £10 unless specifically requested – in which case an SAE would be appreciated. Thanks.

NEAR-MISS IN STOKE

THE BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY came within a hairsbreadth of winning another council seat in Stoke-on-Trent last month, when the BNP candidate came a close second to Labour in a by-election held in the Abbey Green ward.

The full results were: Labour 842; BNP 782; Independent 374; Conservative 249; Liberal Democrats 154; Socialist Alliance 61.

It will be seen that the BNP, whose candidate was John Allen West, trailed a mere 60 votes behind Labour. Measured in percentage terms, the BNP vote came to 32 per cent of the poll, a mere 2 per cent behind Labour, who won with 34 per cent.

The BNP result was achieved with a small team of activists. Had there been

more helpers on the ground, more canvassing could have been done, and the party's second councillor in Stoke elected (the first was Steve Batkin, who won the seat in the Longton North ward last May).

The campaigns of the Liberal Democrats and Socialist Alliance seemed to be concentrated mainly on smearing the BNP – which didn't do the candidates of either much good. On a day when the LibDems were winning the parliamentary seat in Brent East, in London, they could do no better than come fifth in this Stoke election.

One voter said to BNP campaigners that he would be voting BNP because the other parties had no constructive policies to offer, only attacks on their opponents. Indeed, attacking the BNP seemed to be the only

real purpose of the Socialist Alliance standing, with the fringe left-wing party managing a paltry 2.5 per cent of the poll.

A local BNP spokesman told *Spearhead* that the party would probably have won the ward had it had the resources to organise transport for old folk in the area who otherwise would have found it difficult to get to the polling stations – an operation which Labour carried out very thoroughly.

The main thrust of the BNP campaign was multiple leafleting and energetic work on the loudspeakers touring around the streets in cars.

Nevertheless, John West's result was an excellent one, for which he and his team deserve the fullest congratulations from all of us.

Women and the BNP: Observer report misleads

AN interesting, but at least partially misleading, report appeared in *The Observer* on September 21st concerning women and the so-called 'far right'. The report, by Amelia Hill, stated quite correctly that female involvement in nationalist politics in Britain has increased over the past few years, with particular focus on the British National Party. Where it tended to mislead was in implying that in previous times there had been an active discouragement to women to be involved in the party. The report said that "The male hierarchy of the far right has traditionally regarded racial order and the gender order as inextricably linked, using crude definitions of biology, tradition and nature in their defence. In the past few years, however, belief in the rigid social hierarchy has been undermined. Promised a more prominent role, women are joining far-right parties in ever-growing numbers..."

There is a great deal of nonsense in this passage. Firstly, the use of the term 'hierarchy' suggests that believers in the traditional order regarded women as inferior. This was never the case; men and women were regarded as equal but different.

As for women being promised "a more prominent role," everything possible was done in the past to persuade women to become more prominent in the BNP but the rule was adhered to that women should be promoted to senior positions on merit, and not just because they were women. There have been signs recently of a certain kind of 'Blairism' in the party whereby women have been promoted above men for cosmetic political purposes rather than


because they were the most suitable candidates for the positions in question. To this the former leadership of the party was strongly opposed.

One spokeswoman for the BNP was quoted in the report as saying that she regarded abortion as a matter of women's choice – in other words that she supported abortion on demand. It is to be hoped that she was speaking purely for herself and that this is not representative of a new policy direction in the party as a whole.

As to the question of why more women

are prepared to become involved in nationalist movements, that is probably symptomatic of a much more general swing towards nationalism among the British public, as the evils of multi-racialism, liberalism and globalism impact much more damagingly on people than in the past.

The greater female participation in nationalist politics is to be welcomed, but it should not be 'bought' at the price of embracing politically correct and feminist attitudes. At the end of the day, 'feminism' and femininity are incompatible.



Tyndall in Washington, DC

This 65-minute CD is vintage John Tyndall. The former BNP leader is heard addressing American patriots at a location near Washington, DC, during his 1991 speaking tour of the USA.

Every donor of £10 to our church will receive a copy absolutely free.

Please make cheques/POs payable to 'IDENTITY MISSION' and send to:-

**New Christian Crusade Church
Christian Identity Mission
221 Dorset House
Duke Street
Chelmsford
Essex CM1 1TB**